Introduction

Hello there, I am the author of this book. My full name will be answered at the end of the book.
As you can probably guess by the title, this book is about Socialism. But let me first make this clear. I am not a man who talks about raising arms out of violent revolution, talking about the oppression of the worker dealt by the hands of overly frugal aristocrats. Or claims or is claiming about how Capitalism is a menace to life and society. No.
I, like you, am just an average Joe. One who is simply trying to create a form of Socialism that the United States of America can work with. Since America is a very financially strong and free market country, it's only natural for it to see other forms of economics as unfavorable especially after the entirety of the 20th century. For the longest time, the U.S. has not had a good opinion on Socialism. Even in recent years, what with social media spreading good things about it, it hasn't been given a good light by the American people. Although given the groups of peoples and the current choice of politicians praising it, Many of whom not having much of or even the slightest clue on how to properly maintain or even implement it for the American people to benefit

from socialism. It’s not hard to understand why socialism is looked down upon by many Americans, I mean, I wouldn't even bother trusting it if “those'' people were the ones running everything. They’d just run everything into an early grave.
However, if you listen to what I have to say, then you’ll understand that even the American people can benefit from the efforts of socialism. If its placed into the right hands, planned out properly, and implemented slowly but gradually. So with that all said and done, let’s begin.

Adopt Free Trade

Since the dawn of human civilization, trading has been an essential part of how we as humans have built and shaped the world as we see it as today. Trade has existed since even before we began to permanently settle down. Our ancient ancestors who once had to live in caves, hunt large and monstrous beasts to fill their bellies, would also at some point barter and trade for basic goods and necessities ranging from spears for hunting in exchange for something like, say, “fish”. But once we started to farm to create alcohol (yes this is what scholars believe today was what caused ourselves to start permanent settlements), we later began to trade for things like jewelry, clay pots, utensils, clothes, etcetera. Later, technology evolved and we later began trading things like fancy reliquary, boats, and even small houses in exchange for something really valuable. Technology kept evolving and evolving to where we now will trade all things from basic to very fancy for a sum of something which we today call currency.

Now in the past, many socialist countries being centered around a central power were often made into command economies and often in the process made free trade difficult. Sometimes very. However, free trade can occur in countries that are not capitalistic and where there is a central power in control. For example, England. Though yes, not totally a centralized country, England being a constitutional monarchy, is still a monarchy, and a monarchy is officially a form of autocracy. And in Autocracies, the central figure head of the state or government often has significant, majority, or absolute control. Including control over how to regulate the economy and to what degree. Another example would be China. China, despite being a politically communist country, has entered into many free trade agreements with several countries, which includes the United States. Because of these free trade agreements, China has become an economic juggernaut rivaling the U.S. in economic strength. Another example is India. Though yes, not as economically powerful as the United States or China, India is still ranked number 7 of the 10 richest countries in the world as of the 2019 survey and is in many free trade agreements with the United States, the United Arab Emirates, China, the U.K., and so on. And given that India is

already a socialist country, it goes without saying that Free Trade can absolutely benefit American socialism if a form of free-trade focused socialism is properly implemented.

Institutionalize Competency

As the saying goes, one man is only as great as his mind. Same goes for women, And like all societies, if the most competent person in what respective fields they work for is left in charge, then they will most surely succeed in fulfilling their task effectively, however, when looking back on the history of socialist countries, a common trope has repeatedly occurred in many of those countries. From the great blunders of the USSR during the war between Russia and Finland and in the earlier days of WWII to China's great leap forward, and recently Venezuela's and Bolivia's depressing economies. A noticeable trope between these and several other nations that I just don't have space or motivation to mention, have in common is the trope of recurring improper management and foresight.

Indeed, except for the more resilient countries who actually knew how to handle their governments

through either experience from the previous government or knowing the jobs and responsibilities that came with it, many socialist states in the past had seemingly suffered the problem of not properly or not appointing the right people for the job. Oftentimes such positions were given off to people who were more fanatical to the state and the ideology rather than to those who were much more skilled at the job. For example in the USSR before WWII and after Joseph Stalin's great purges. Positions of power were placed into the hands of people who were better at kissing Stalin's boots rather than prioritizing commands and responsibilities correctly and efficiently. And because of this irresponsibility, the USSR ended up suffering great casualties during the earlier days of operation Barbarossa. It was only until the Soviet high command finally started focusing on competent leadership rather than more devoted leadership, along with the great cold that is Russia's winter, that the USSR turned the tide and started steamrolling Nazi Germany's Weirmacht back into Germany.

Another example would be Chairman Mao's Great Leap Forward. Despite its good intentions in trying to feed and industrialize China, due to Chairman Mao forgetting or refusing to acknowledge that the

Chinese people had very little knowledge on steel and ironworking, he unintentionally made the great leap forward into an accidental mass starvation. Which led to many people butchered, tortured, and humiliated by its own soldiers and governors simply for needing to eat. One such example of how horrible it got was of a farmer who was forced to bury his own son and wife alive for simply unearthing a potato.

If Chairman Moa had put better thought and perspective into the Great Leap Forward, millions would not have died.

Another example is surprisingly modern, North Korea. In the DPRK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) or North Korea as what we're all familiar with. Currently, its court system states that no high judge or supreme court judge requires ANY form of high credentials or a doctorate in law to attain a seat of power. All the official needs to have is a firm and devoted belief in the state and the Juche ideology. Meaning anyone from the lowest part of the Korean government can, if they have that much of a fanaticism for the state and legal system, be allowed to serve in the North Korean court system. Which means as long as you are very devoted to the Korean government, then no matter how good you actually are qualified for the job, you

can be ushered in as the newest Korean supreme court justice, and with how corrupt the DPRK government is, its no surprise that all it takes is a little sucking up to the state to be granted a good position.

Truly, if any of these countries had simply chosen their people more wisely, a whole lot of things that went wrong would, not have happened and a great deal of things more would have come out of their decisions. Truly if men fit for their jobs were the ones put in charge of overseeing and maintaining order in any one of the socialist countries of then and now, then so many socialist states would rely less on fanaticism and be great wellsprings of culture, influence, and wealth. But the future awaits us.

Allow Free Speech and The Criticism of Officials

Looking back at the history of socialist countries, many had instituted censorship of some kind and at a point of severity that varied from country to country. Some of which disallowed its citizens and officials to even criticize the state or other officials. However due to this, many people were often ousted from office or arrested for simply having an opposing opinion. Some of which even arrested for

slight differences, or in cases of abuse, no differences at all but because one manipulated the system to get another person they had a vendetta against arrested.

For sure, in many places and in many more ways, people were severely punished for their views and opinions, all because the state had enacted a law stating that no one was allowed to criticize the government or any of its officials, regardless of whether or not the state was aware that the crime rate would skyrocket, causing mass prison sentences which then clogged up space that could've been used to build factories, businesses, homes, and farms, and time that could've been spent on improving local infrastructure, trade, and resource management. In the end eventually dries up the government treasury due to all the new prisoners it has to now take care of, house, feed, clothe, and in some cases educate.

All simply because the citizens and politicians alike who had mixed or poor feelings for another bad at their job politician(s) for running the state poorly were thrown in prison because that politician or the state didn't like to hear what they had to say about them.

People…. are complicated creatures, and none of them, no matter how powerful or how great of

status that they’ve attained, are just as the same as every other human being in shape and form. The lowest peasant will have the same body structure and biology as that of a king. Every tramp and homeless person has the same need for food, water, security, shelter, and psychological security as any billionaire. And since all people have the same needs and biology, they all have the same ability to voice their opinions and thoughts, and when that ability is stripped away from them against their will, people will do what they’ve always done in times of strife: Revolt, be imprisoned, make it absolute hell on their rulers, and either reform or destroy the very system that took away their ability to speak.

Limit Collective Farming

We’ve all seen what happens with collective farming, in the world of collective farming, the stereotype is that the government takes most of or all of the food produced by the farms and then

spectacularly ruins everything by causing mass famines by accident, imprisons the farmers, and (for some reason) feeds the imprisoned farmers better than the starving people, and then people outside the camps are lining up for bread lines. Or getting shot up by guards and soldiers and policemen alike for trying to snatch a loaf of bread to feed themselves. I'm not one to call things inherently terrible, but it goes without saying that total collectivization of agriculture, or basically anything that begins with good intentions will later everything go to hell because it was all mismanaged and misused.

So instead of total collectivization, why not partial collectivization? In the United States on an annual basis the country simply throws out 40% of all its food. Most of it from farmers whose food simply wasn't appealing to buyers and retailers, and whatmore, only 30% of that 40% (10% of what's wasted) of food came from the United States itself. Take that one in for a moment, more than a third of all food in the U.S. is simply thrown away every year and three fourths of it is food that came from our own country. America is a rich country, and as such has the money available to import food from other countries, however, there is a problem with this, because the U.S. has become such a wealthy

nation, the country is able to simply import more food than it can produce, which means most food we eat on a daily basis is not even food that comes from our own farms. In fact its actually estimated that 32% of all farm grown veggies, livestock, and grains actually come from our northern neighbor Canada. And another 49% from our southern neighbor Mexico.

Now take that one in for a moment. Not even 50% of our own country's food source is from our own farms. America being the landmass juggernaut rivalling China in size and power is not even eating food from its own farms and what more, its simply throwing out 31% of that 40% for not being appealing enough to retailers. America's landfills are said to be estimated to be 15% food waste, and perhaps, not guaranteed, but perhaps, partial collective farming is maybe the answer? A social program where 30-40% of all food in the U.S. is collected and stored in large granaries and warehouses and through the prospect of maybe charities and cheap marketing, maybe that mass of wasted food will disappear. 1/6th of all Americans can't get good access to food and water, so a program that rounds up that much food from going bad might just be the answer to reducing that number. This would save lots of food from going

bad and would allow the farmers to be in control of most of the food they produced. If the program were designed to purchase food from the farmers and retailers rather than just simply collecting it without payment, then i’d say most, if not all of the farmers and retailers would happily sign up for this program where one third of their food is taken and paid for, severely reducing the amount of food waste we generate in our landfills and giving impoverished and homeless people, along with people of poorer nations if America decides to open up trade with these poorer nations, a better chance to attain a proper source of nourishment.

Restructure the Education System

Let’s face it, the American school system is terrible. Student test scores are lower, zero tolerance has caused more harm than good, and the no child left behind policy instituted during the George W Bush era, though good in concept, failed terribly with bringing up test scores and getting children graduated. Not only that, but vocational education is no longer part of the wider education system and most kids openly admit that once they finish school, the very next day, week, or month (depending on the child’s memory) after graduation completely forget the work they spent so much time working on, to pass their exams. Finally, the worst part of our school system that needs to be pointed out is that the school system is simply too old. Our school system has remained widely unchanged since the first Industrial era. The traditional school of being told when to come in, when to eat and rest, being scored on how good of work you’ve done, all stems from Factory work. Your teacher is like your factory instructor, and the school the factory. The class, your specific production line and the lunch and recess being your scheduled breaks. Don’t believe me? Look it up. Compulsory education was originally enstated

in Massachusetts in 1852 and eventually the entire U.S. by the 1920s.
I say its time we adopt a new form of education that can be best suited for the ever increasingly automated and computerized world we live in.
I imagine a school lined up with computer desks, where all test taking is done on the computer. Instead of college level classes like trigonometry and geometry, we instead incorporate state funded vocational courses modeled after trade schools where education is a mostly hands on experience, rather than hand written courses that offer no real experience or skills except for maybe office work. Set up restaurant style lunch rooms and have the children pose as waiters and waitresses to gain restaurant experience, after all as my mother once said, “as long as you know how to serve tables, you will be able to find a job anywhere.” We can do something similar to what the Japanese do with their students by having them aid the school in weekly janitorial duties so that they’d gain some experience as a janitor or custodian, and help them learn how to use and handle dangerous chemicals properly. If the Japanese, a very disciplined (and pagan) society can become the 4th largest economy on earth then we as Americans who have the number 1 largest economy on earth should

learn from them a bit. After all, before China and South Korea, they were the 2nd biggest economy. They only really declined a bit because their neighbors emulated from them. Japan was the economic dinamo of the east at the time, so it was only natural that their other fellow east asian neighbors would look to them for awe and inspiration.

We could also implement video game and entertainment technology too. Admit it, a lot of us often remember most of what we found entertaining, and often video games, movies, television shows, and viral videos have often been what we found to remember most in our lives. I, for one, learned nothing about economics while attending high school. I learned most of what my teacher had attempted to teach me from playing multiple games pertaining to the same kinds of information my teacher had attempted to teach me, and all he did was tell me something I already knew.

Most schools, I bet you don’t even teach you how to sign or mail an envelope anymore, let alone how to manage your money and resources to help you survive, thrive, and contribute to society or the economy as a whole. Can you remember the last time your teacher took you outside to learn how to

forage for berries and help you identify which ones weren’t poisonous? I sure as hell do not. The only thing I can recall learning from school is one thing I remember from economics class, learning what the Laffer Curve was. That’s all I can honestly remember. Everything else is a total blur or it was already learnt information.
Another thing we could do is create schools with dormitories. Boarding schools basically. With on campus businesses and a school bank to give children who need to gain work experience a chance to learn and understand how the real world works with a more hands on approach. Dormitories could be modeled to look like apartment complexes and the students attending could simulate a home experience for when before they move out of their homes for real. They could use the businesses or business-like classes to experience the real world before actually entering the real world. Math classes could be replaced with banking and stock market courses, architecturale classes, technical support and computer repair classes, or engineering classes. Science courses aside from middle school level courses could be replaced with biotechnology courses, medicinal botany classes, paramedics training, and so on. As for gym class… let’s be honest, that’s really the

only part that doesn’t need to change. Gym class is good the way it is. Although making a sport a school requirement would be nice i guess. Perhaps Football anyone?

Pay off peoples’ debts through manual labor

From the title alone, it would sound like slavery. Well you would be forgiven for thinking as such. This form of manual labor I am referring to is derived from the Aztec form of slavery. Where rather than people be permanently shackled to a life of physical labor which they have no escape from. People who instead being victims of war or of forced servitude are actually our fellow citizens whom have become so poor that they must sign over their rights to the federal government to work the fields as a slave to gradually reduce their debts.

Although grim in its portrayal, is not as bad as it seems. As like the Aztec form of slavery, slaves or people in this case, are to be treated fairly well, severe punishments are outlawed, and their debts remain frozen until fully paid off. And if one

chooses to buy something, their purchases would rather than being raised absorbently high for small purchases, would instead be the same amount as it would for any convenience store. Debts are not passed down after the indebted person dies and if the person ever decides to have children, education is free and the child does not have to help the parent’s pay off the debt or inherit it. People even when being worked by others have rights too you know, and if they can’t pay off their debts properly, then help them by giving them a job and let them pay it off gradually over time, and should they get hurt, give them medical assistance and you decide whether they get to continue to work or relinquish all their debts and give them their freedom back.

Author’s note: Oh how history is the grandest teacher one can receive? I truly think it is.

And if they wish to stay even when their debts are paid off, give them the opportunity by offering them a job or offer one in another field of work or expertise if there are no positions available. If they come out with their debts paid but nowhere to go, give them some money and send them on their way or give them a home somewhere and let them

live their lives however they choose. Just don’t make the rent unreasonably big. No one wants to live in an apartment built for $200 and be rented out for over $1,000. Just ask the average Californian or New Yorker that and they’ll probably agree unanimously.

If the person is undereducated on what they’re supposed to do for the job they’ve been assigned to, then give them the basics of relevant education before sending them to do their job. Skilled work ALWAYS pays off better than more work. If they’re unfit for their job due to mental, medical, or physical purposes, then give them another job that they can adjust to and work with, If the work is too much to bear, ease the work to make it more bearable, if the work is too slow or too fast, even out the pacing, if too dangerous, make it safer or assign them a safer job and let a professional handle it.

People cannot just be sent in to do a specific job without proper training or equipment, and if people are to pay off their debts, they must be first prepared to understand the jobs in which they’re going to work in order to pay off those debts. If they aren’t, then, like how forced labor was and is in many other places throughout time, will just become a huge economic hindrance as it becomes

too expensive to house, cloth, and feed all these people who will offer us little-to-nothing in return before or after paying off their debts, except financial hell and food shortages. We’re all looking at you, North Korea. Fix it or lose it!

(Authors note: The reason why such a topic as forced labor has been brought up in this book is to address the concern of slavery. Even in modern times, the concept of slavery still persist. Though yes the traditional idea of slave labor by being chained up and forced into permanent servitude is no longer the case in today’s world, the concept of slavery and or forced labor is always being re-written and re-defined. Once the traditional form of slavery was abolished, it instead of disappearing just rebranded itself into something slightly cleaner, that of course, I'm talking about is paid employment for a meager payment AND incarceration. Why even the 13th amendment says clearly in section 1 that slave labor is illegal except to those who are in jail, so even if we do ‘abolish’ slavery, it’s just going to be re-written and re-defined as something else. In today’s world, the modern definition means to toil away in less than healthy conditions. Meaning simply working in a factory that pays mediocrely and provides only

basic working conditions can be defined as slave labor.
So rather than avoid this concept all together, no matter how controversial it is, I decided it was best to outright address it rather than ignore it and have it potentially lead to an unwanted cataclysm. After all, without proper thought, no good thing will come out of anything by just simply ignoring it.)

Illegalize Single Party Rule

Throughout the history of Socialism, a common trope often occurred where many socialist states adopted one form or another kind of single party rule. Why, even in China and North Korea, the communist parties of both countries still hold complete control to this day. This tradition originally starting in the U.S.S.R. has had a profound impact on the history of Socialism, as

much of it has led to its negative outlook by many Liberal democracies of today.
Why we must illegalize it is simple. So not to allow the rise of dictatorial rule. Socialism has often been plagued by nations where corrupt leaders and authority figures often take control and, rather than enrich the country like they're supposed to as the leaders of that country, instead enrich themselves and become the very aristocratic dictators that they often had spouted as their ideological enemies. Surely when looking at examples such as Geddafi's Libya, Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe, Mao Zedong's China, Joseph Stalin's Russia, Kim il-Song's North Korea, and Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany (Yes it was officially a socialist country too. Look it up) and you will see that a country which enforces a single party rule will more often than not lead to a lackluster dictatorial rulership, so why not just do things like what Portugal and India are doing. That's right you read it correctly, India and Portugal are officially socialist countries as well, and, though socialism is not always a focus point for them, they have managed to maintain sizably good economies and fairly stable governments. They are both imperfect democracies with 2 party systems and many minor political parties. For this they have become

decently stable countries, and through proper choice of leadership, have become ranked as the number 42nd(Portugal) and 6th(India) largest economies on Earth.
The second reason why we should illegalize single party rule is to prevent the arrival of Fascism. Contrary to popular belief, Fascism is not an ideology of military style dictativism, where the government is ran and maintained by military strength. No. Fascism as explained in its true definition is “A single political party or political entity possessing complete power of a country or organization, often with an aggressive agenda (the official definition has some historical inaccuracies to it as fascist countries like Italy and Germany were actually pro-socialist countries. Why that’s important is because the official definition cites it as a far right leaning ideology. When it historically has popped up in more left leaning countries.). This meaning that regardless of whether or not the country is left-leaning or right-leaning, fascism can rise as long as there is an aggressive agenda involved, so having a single party system would lead us closer to the rise of fascism if we were to allow our country to inch closer to a single party government, so to prevent our country divulging into the same corruption and human rights

violations perpetrated by certain previous and current socialist governments, and to prevent the rise of fascism, we must take a firm stance by Illegalizing a single party rule political system.

Constitutionalize 3 party rule

As mentioned previously, the adoption of a single party system for a, mostly democratic,

constitutional republic that is the United States is hypocritical. Especially since more often than not, single party systems usually lead to dictatorial governments, often engaging in and hiding various human rights violations. And many other crimes and misdemeanors that it would take one very long chapter or 3 long chapters to explain all of the crimes that single party government countries had done in the past. Instead of a single party government, or a duo party government like how it is in the current United States, I suggest that we, instead, adopt a tri-party government where the vote is much more democratically split 3 ways amongst the people, and where the parties similarly to the current United States are split based on which side of the political compass they are on. 1 for the Liberals, 1 for the Conservatives, and 1 for the Moderates, where a 2/3rds majority vote decides policy decisions when made in an assembly, but law is still upheld by the code of law and prevents any majority vote from deciding a bill or act that is unconstitutional. This way, the major parties, along with the various minor political parties that come with it, will not be able to simply intersect each other’s decision by being part of the same category (that being liberal or conservative), as the moderate party will then be able to block

each other’s intersectionality by being its own separate category, effectively blocking any liberal AND conservative decisions, unless the moderate party agrees on one or the other. Now, despite this being a book on socialism, you may be reasonably wondering why this is a part of the book. The answer is simple, regardless of whatever political affiliation you are a part of, the opposing side’s arguments and beliefs are necessary for progress to be ushered forward.

You cannot be liberalistic without knowing or being opposed by a conservative and it is the same for the inverse, and not only that, but it is possible for people to affiliate with one political leaning but be sympathetic or even outright agree with the values and beliefs of an opposing party’s values and beliefs. It is possible to be a liberal with some conservative values and be a conservative with some liberal values. There are such things as liberal-Republicans and conservative-Democrats. It is indeed possible for even far-left and far-right individuals to have some of either's beliefs if they so choose to.

So rather than choosing to oppose differing values and beliefs, as shuning the opposition in most instances only breeds more opposition, it is instead better to embrace the people who accept these

beliefs as it provides more stability, unity, and a diversity of opinion and thought, for diversity is only a strength when the people are at an agreement, and an opposition of someone’s thoughts and beliefs no matter how liberalistic or conservative they are, does not make a diverse pool of people more unified. It just makes everything homogeneous, stagnant, and less likely to allow for cooperation to exist, which is why a 3 party system is perhaps the best system to choose, as it keeps the opposing political thoughts of conservatism and liberalism buffered by moderatism, allowing for a diverse opinion of thought and preventing either thought from homogenizing the political landscape and causing the rift in politics like we are currently seeing today.

Create a limited Universal Basic Income Program

With the recent failure of Finland's universal basic health care system, it wouldn’t be surprising if people were skeptical or even outright hostile to the concept of universal basic income in the United States, especially with the kind Congress-Woman Alexandria Ocasio Cortez tried to push in the widely panned Green New Deal. Admittingly, I myself am not very supportive of having a universal basic income as it would very likely stagger the workforce and industrial complex greatly and hemorrhage the U.S. economy quite hard, however, that isn’t to say that I think it can’t work or doesn’t work. F, far from it. Rather, I do believe if it were to simply be limited, then it could work. Emphasis on could. I am not an economist nor claiming to be, but please continue to hear me out on this one.

If we were to limit the amount of money a person can receive and penalize them if people are caught grouping together to pool their money together by say claiming to live underneath the same household when they do not, identity fraud, or not qualifying for the income; and keep the limit low,

but to a reasonable limit, let’s say 200 dollars, then by 2019 estimates of all the money gathered by the federal government during that fiscal year. The entire federal government had gathered 3.438 trillion dollars. By dividing that with the entire U.S. population at the time which was 328.2 million people, we come down to a conclusion of 10,475.31 dollars per person. Meaning out of every single American, they’d all account almost 10,500 dollars for all the money gathered during that fiscal year. Then divide the 10,475.31 people by 52.374 percent, and you’d get 200 dollars exactly.
This meaning that the government would have to spend 52.374 percent or 5,486.33 dollars of the 10,475.31 dollars each American represents, which, when multiplied by 328 million as in the 328 million Americans, comes to 1,799,516,240,000 dollars, or 1.799 trillion dollars. Meaning the government would have to spend 1.799 trillion dollars each year and would receive back the remaining 47.626 percent or 4,988.97 dollars, meaning that for each person, the government would receive back 4,988.97 dollars, which when multiplied by 328 million equals up to 1,636,382,216,000 dollars, or 1.636 trillion dollars. Concluding that of the 3 trillion spent that year, 1.799 trillion would be spent on all Americans

getting a 200 dollar basic income with 1.636 trillion being returned or left.
However this approach will not be used as the basing of the income system, for basing it on how valued each American is amongst the crowd, would be damaging both physically and morally (no one likes knowing what the price of their head is), so to curb this issue, the government will instead rely on a manufactured approach. This meaning that everything is much more simple to understand and is not such a large headache on the economy or people who need to understand it.

(Author’s note: the same math will apply later when going over the aged 18 and above only part of the U.S. population)

Now if we were to divide the 328 million people by 200, we’d get 1,640,000 dollars, meaning that for every person, the country would only have to spend 1,640,200 dollars each week, multiply that by 4 for each week of a month, then on a monthly basis the country would have to pay 6,560,000 dollars, and finally multiply that by 12 for each of the 12 months of the year and we round it all to 78,720,000 dollars, meaning that 78,720,000 dollars would have to be spent out of the 3.438

trillion dollars. This bringing us to only 0.0022 percent of the entire money of that fiscal year being spent on the 200 dollar basic income system annually, and when dividing the same 78 million with the U.S.’s total spending deficit of that year, that being 984 billion dollars, we’d get a percentage of 0.0079 percent of the 984 billion the U.S. spent that fiscal year being added in to pay for the system, meaning that, annually, the U.S. government would only have to spend less than 0.01 percent of its total spending rate to pay for the basic income system. BUT. That would only be the income paid if everyone were on the system, since the system would apply optionally, then the actual cost of the system will vary wildly. , but be most beneficial especially to those who have a disability, are a retired veteran(If not on pension that is), have a severe injury or illness, on maternity leave, unemployed, homeless, and (in likely rare cases) employed but have fallen under the livable income rate.

The actual number of people it would give money out to based on estimates would be 117,367,715 Americans, meaning the amount of money out of all the American veteran (pensionless) and disabled population the United States would have to pay would be 33% of the 78,720,000 dollars it

would’ve had to pay for every American, which would be 25,977,600 dollars in total, which when divided by the total spending deficit would be 0.0027 percent of the total deficit and an additional 0.0027 percent added to the fiscal year’s spending. Reducing the original addition of 0.0079 percent by 0.0052 percent.

So in conclusion, if this limited basic income system were to be added into the U.S.’s total spending, then each year if fully implemented to all citizens would only cost 78 million dollars and contribute to 0.0079 percent of its yearly spending, or if implemented to only the 33% of Americans suffering from some sort of ailment or disability would only cost 25+ million dollars annually and contribute to 0.0027 percent of the yearly spending, so with that, I do believe that it is in theory possible for the United States to implement both a universal basic income system and a partial basic income system with a 200 dollar minimum without it severely hemorrhaging the U.S. economy or workforce too greatly, but that however would only apply to literally everyone in the United States including those below the age of 18. For everyone below the age of 18, which as of the U.S. census of 2019 was 22.4 percent of the population, they would make up 14,618,303 people. Which would

mean that the true total number of people this would apply to if above the age of 18 would be 312,831,697 Americans. So take that number and divide it by the 3.438 trillion dollars made that fiscal year. Dividing it you will get 10,989.93 dollars, meaning that for each American the age of 18 and above, they'd account for nearly 11,000 dollars. Now take the 10,989.93 dollars and divide it by 54.949 percent and it will come to 200 dollars exactly, meaning that of the 10,989.93 dollars, 6,038.85 dollars would be spent out of each American that fiscal year to give out 200 dollars for every American aged 18 and above. Take 6,038.85 and multiply it by 328 million as in the 328 million americans and you'll get 1,990,742,280,000 dollars, or 1.990 trillion dollars. Concluding that the remaining 45.051 percent of the 10,989.93 dollars, or 4,951.07 dollars not spent would go back to the government. The remaining 4,951.07 dollars when multiplied by 328 million equals 1,623,950,960,000 dollars. Or 1.623 dollars, meaning of the 3.438 trillion dollars, the government would be repaid 1.623 trillion dollars out of the 1.990 trillion it'd have to spend.

Again, however, this would only apply if based on a direct value of all Americans, which as stated before would be both a physical and moral

nightmare, so this shall be avoided in favor of a more manufactured approach rather than a direct value approach.
Now, take the aged 18 and above population of 312 million and divide it by 200. Dividing it and you will get 1,560,000, meaning each week the government would have to spend 1,560,000 dollars for every American. Now, multiply it by 4 for each 4 weeks of a month and you'll get 6,240,000, meaning for each month, the government will have to pay 6,240,000 dollars, then, finally multiply it by 12 and you'll receive 74,880,000 dollars, meaning that, of every year, disregarding the actual population shift that takes place every year, the government would only have to pay 74,880,000 dollars. Now, take that and divide it by 3.438 trillion and you'll get a percentage of 0.0021 percent,
and when dividing the same 74 million with the national deficit of 984 billion dollars, we'd get 0.0076 percent. Concluding that all Americans aged 18 and above would account for an additional 0.0076 percent of the U.S. deficit if a basic income system were to be made, and that the government would if it chose to enact a limited basic income would only need to spend less than 1 percent of its total fiscal income each year.

Now, how would the government be able to divide the 1.56 million dollars to give out 200 dollars is simple. Take the 1,560,000 dollars the government would need to spend every month and divide it by 7,800, doing this will come to 200 exactly. How'd it come to 6,240,000 dollars a month is also simple, take the 6.24 million and divide it by 7,800 as well. This will come down to 800. And finally take the 78,880,000 dollars and divide it by 8,216.66 and you will come to 9,600.00.

With all this information, I can conclude that the American people can be ensured to receive a 200 dollar a week, 800 dollar a month, and a 9,600 dollar a year basic income.

However, this is not to say that the government is obligated to do so. If, for whatever reason, the government were to find that the UBI system is unaffordable or a drag on the system, then, in regard to the circumstances, the government should be allowed to remove or disband the income system however it sees fit. No governing institution should be forced to uphold a system that drains its pockets unnecessarily or produces unforeseen negatives that do more harm than good. Just hope for whatever cataclysm that appears that it be nothing long term or permanent.

(Author’s note: Math. UGHHHH!!. So frustrating.)
(editor’s note: spot on)

Limit Political Correctness

Though yes previously i had stated that limiting freedom of speech would not sit well with the American people, given that limiting ones speech usually results in them breaking unnecessary and frankly stupid rules, but given the current political

climate where the overzealous supporters of the political correctionist movements have hindered people politically, and in some severe cases, financially, it goes without saying that the speech of political correctness, if not properly regulated can become a hazardous force not to be reckoned with or admired, especially by the more moderate people of the United States. There have been cases in which protesters have divulged into riotous mobs in the name of social justice and political correctness, as was the case with Fox News anchormen Tucker Carlson whom had his house marched on and his front door and house damaged by protesters. Because of this utter display of hostility, court justices declared the riot to be an act of terrorism, though yes, a little extreme for a riot to be labeled as such, the amount of violence and damage the riot created out of their political beliefs can however easily be considered an act of terrorism.

(Authors note: For those not aware or familiar with the definition of terrorism, terrorism is defined as the willful act of indescriminatory violence out of a political goal or reason.)

With many smaller scaled instances of people committing violence happening all over the country, as it is so drenched over social media,

tensions continue to rise and it seems to not be ending anytime soon, as a result of these political movements, cancel culture has become prevalent. Entire organizational events, television programs, movie projects, and political rallies opposed to political correctness are getting called out by staunch supporters and shut down. Political correctness, which used to mean “that which the society saw as correct by political standards” now means “to avoid anything that is offensive”, And with a whole world of things the overzealous left is deeming offensive, it wouldn’t be surprising if the words ‘political correction’ became offensive words to someone, heck to many who’re persteringly reminded of the phrase, some have already deemed them offensive words.

If the political correctness movements are to make whatever words they deem unfit and then go out of their way to both intentionally and accidentally call various words offensive, then perhaps we must place restrictions on how one can be with political correctness. For we cannot continue to cancel each and everything non-politically aligned with us or deemed offensive until we have no more words left to call offensive. By how much of a restriction should be placed may vary, but whatever the size, make it enough to not allow a bunch of

incompetent demogouge zealots turn everything into an attack on ones feelings and willingness to coexist.

(Author’s note: For the people that’re reading this book, this section is specifically focused on the culture war and is not entirely focused on governance.)

Keep the Tax Rate at 33% or Lower

Aw taxes, the age old problem that throughout civilized history has been a total pain in the ass. From the beginnings of basic organization in ancient Mesopotamia, to the modern juggernauts such as the United States and China, taxes have played an essential role in how well governments remain funded and functional; how well armies remain standing; and how well the life back at home remains good and prosperous.

However, the true role on how well taxes play in our world is how high or how low the rate of taxation is fixed and how high of a surplus it brings in for the people and government to use in public and private works.

If the rate is low, generally speaking, the economy tends to grow high, as the rate allows for commerce to generate wealth with rather few hindrances to stop it from being generated, which allows for more people who’re more invested to seek employment and housing in an area so cheap to live in, and typically in areas where the taxes are high, the quality of living, though typically good in areas where the percentage is 40 or 50 percent, are typically where the economy starts to slow down or stagnate and become rather burdensome to the people that reside there. Such as the case with China where their tax rate is estimated to be

45 percent, but due to the relaxed laws in how well a worker is paid and treated, making ends meet in China is rather difficult, and though yes the economy of China is often compared to be on par with the United States, the actual amount of money the average person receives is rather low.
Another example would be Japan. Their tax rate is 50% and though, yes workers are treated fairly better than in China, the conditions and payment is in some ways comparatively the same, with companies often giving people rather small wages for their work and making the working conditions often just within the legal minimum requirements, which is especially *taxing*(I’m going to hell for that one), since most Japanese companies typically have a very teamwork focused style of operation, where one mess up can lead to in some cases the entire office or production line getting punished. And potentially leading to one’s employment being terminated if their performance isn’t the best shape.
Truly, it goes without saying that high taxes lead to low wages, and low wages leads to limited prosperity.
This can be solved easily with the Laffer Curve. For those not familiar, the Laffer Curve is a Keynesian supply-side economics curve that measures the

point at which the production rate meets the market exchange rate, but the curve can also be applied to the tax rate, measuring where and when the tax rate meets the amount of income it will receive from its rate. In most cases the Laffer Curve indicates that usually around the 33 percentile mark, the amount of income a government receives from the tax rate generates a break even income rate. Where in most cases anything over 33% begins to generate a negative income rate. A negative income rate usually means that the income rate cannot receive enough income to afford its own tax rate. An example would be a city with massive skyscrapers and massive amounts of infrastructure. In order for the infrastructure to be maintained, the tax rate is set under 33 percent, since business is great, many are usually willing to give out a small portion of their money to allow the government to pay for improving the infrastructure, but eventually the infrastructure becomes too expensive for the current taxation rate and so the rate is risen. Not much of a change so the people are generally fine seeing a small but slightly larger portion of their money taken and used on public works, then everything becomes more expensive due to land value, and so to make sure the government can

have a larger pool of money to afford to pay for the now much more expensive property, the government raises the tax revenue to 33 percent. This is where the Laffer Curve comes into effect. You see with previous tax rates, the curve showed that the lower the tax rate, the more willing people were to live and work in the area, as the low tax rates often meant it was cheaper to buy plots of land, and lesser financial burdens to deal with, since businesses would often have more money to pay their workers after the annual taxes were over, and property owners would often have enough money to keep living on their property after the yearly property tax.

However, with the tax rate increased, the businesses and property owners would both then have to increase the amount of money they'd have to give to the government, which would mean a smaller sum of money they'd get to keep each tax increase. The higher the rate went up, the more likely people and businesses would begin to contemplate leaving or leave outright, as the higher tax rate would mean more money from their money pool they'd have to give out to the government.

Once the government raises it to 33 percent, the businesses and property owners would then have

to take away 33 percent of all the money they'd gained, or have left, or of the amount of which their property is worth to the government. 33 percent would be 1/3rd of all the money a company or property owner would make in a year, meaning 33 percent of all the money their property is worth, or their company makes would go straight to the government, thus lessening the available money pool the company can use on maintenance, repairs, the worker's payroll, and the property owner's bank account.

Since the rate would affect 33 percent of the company or property owner's money pool, the company and property owner would usually have just enough money to afford to pay all its workers and the property value that the land is worth, which, when placed onto the Laffer Curve, would lead to a break-even tax rate, as 33 percent is usually where most businesses and property owners would be just contempt enough to stay in the city and be willing to pay for its infrastructure. Now, everything's property value increases and the public works become more expensive to maintain, so then the rate is raised to above 33 percent, this is where the income rate sees a decline in the income rate. The rise of taxes coupled with the larger amount of money the businesses and

property owners would have to give out is higher than they’re comfortable with paying for, so what will the companies and property owners do? Move away. First the people with a meager income will be the first ones to sell off their things and leave for a more suitable area. Doing so will lower the positive income rate substantially, as what was basically much of the middle class just up and left. The positive income rate in all this means the amount of money that will rise above the percentage rate, meaning if the percentage rate is 25 percent, then the amount of people who will be willing to pay the tax rate will be high as they’d have a very sizable portion of money left after giving that money away. If the city of people had a population of 1,000,000, then all the people would give 25 percent of their money to the government. Now say they all had an average of 100,000 dollars each, but 3rd class citizens only generate 10,000 to 40,000 each year, the middle class generates 50,000 to 70,000 each year, and first class generates 80,000 to 130,000 each year. For every one person, 25 percent of their money would be taxed, resulting in 25,000 dollars from each person being placed in the city’s treasury each year, leading to 25,000,000,000 dollars each year from

all 1,000,000 citizens. Now the tax rate is raised above 33 percent.
33 percent would’ve meant 33,000 out of every 100,000 dollars would be taxed by each property owner and business that only had 100,000 dollars each year, but the tax rate was raised to 35 percent, meaning each year, businesses and property owners would have to pay 35,000 dollars out of 100,000 each year to pay to live in and continue business in the city. Civilians and businesses who’re cautious of their finances see this as intolerable or inhospitable since they don’t generate enough money or have enough money to keep on giving money for the current tax rate each year, so the ones who don’t make 100,000 dollars each year leave and it reduces the population and the potential money pool for the city government to tax from. Let’s say 10 percent of the civilian and business population leaves as a result of this tax rate increase.
Meaning 100,000 people and let’s say 1,000 out of 100,000 businesses who couldn’t afford this tax increase leave because the tax increase was too much for them to afford or handle. The infrastructure still remains, however, and the price value of the property remains the same, despite the massive amount of people and businesses

leaving, so the tax rate remains the same, but because the infrastructure still remains, it still is going to need to be repaired and maintainedut with the money pool lessened and these issues still needing to be resolved, the tax rate is increased again to say 40 or 50 percent to allow for the city government to try and get more money to afford to repair it all. The income rate at first rises, but due to the raised tax rate, more people and businesses end up leaving, mainly the upper third class and lower second class as they can also no longer be able to afford to live in the city as they are unable to generate the 40,000 or 50,000 dollars each year, this results in a loss of taxable civilians and businesses, and lowers the amount of money the city government can gain to pay for public works. The issues of infrastructure still exist and the property value remains since the condition of the homes and buildings are still good, so the tax rate is again raised to this time 75 percent, meaning for every 100,000 dollars each person has, 75,000 is taken leaving the company and property owner 25,000 left each year. The population and amount of businesses decreases and finally only the richest of the rich and the poorest of the poor remain. Why the poor remain is simply because the city tax rate has risen so high that the 3rd class cannot raise

enough money to simply sell off their property and leave. They'd have enormous tax deficits on their banking records too great to simply ignore or pay off, but why is it that they haven't left already is because of 2 simple answers. Answer 1 is since the largest portions of the middle class and lower upper class have all but disappeared. The space left to attain the jobs necessary to stay within the livable range in the city have been made available to the 3rd class giving some the ability to remain in the city just enough to afford the tax rate, but as for the ones that couldn't, we have answer 2. Answer 2 is because the people who couldn't find jobs necessary to sustain themselves lost their homes due to heavy debts and are likely homeless and wandering the roads to other cities or asking for spare change, or incarcerated due to being unable to afford all the money they weren't able to afford to pay off.

Around this point, the city's population and business population has been severely depleted and the money supply the city can tax is direly low, but the city still needs to pay for its infrastructure. Tax rate increases to 100 percent, now virtually everyone, except for the very rich people and richest businesses, can continue to live in the city. So if placed on the Laffer Curve, the tax rate would

be at 100 percent, but with the utter depletion of taxable people, the amount of money the city government can get each year is 10 percent or lower since a whopping large amount of the city's population has just left. The infrastructure deteriorates and eventually crumbles due to lack of repair.

(Author's note: This was just a thought experiment to make it easier for readers to understand how the Laffer Curve functions. Realistically, a city wouldn't do something so glaringly terrible and would likely read the situation and reduce the tax rate, nor would civilians just leave and never come back or there'd never be an influx of civilians even if the tax rate increases. Some people, despite the high taxes of some cities, will still move there regardless of it being a potential economic pitfall. It happens sometimes. Finally, businesses wouldn't just up and leave as the potential for business won't always be so promising elsewhere, nor is there a guarantee that somewhere else will have a better chance for the business to survive even if it has lower tax rates, property values, or a much larger population. In some cases, businesses have tried this and have ended up suffering more than they initially expected, with some cases even resulting in outright dissolution.)

So, now all that’s left for the city is to either default and let the city crumble slowly, as it can’t afford to pay for the repairs necessary for the infrastructure, or lower the tax rate.
Like most of us, we’d most likely choose the latter. The tax rate lowers, and thus, more people come in and the city begins to grow once more. The tax rate is lowered so drastically that now it is underneath the 33 percentile mark. People are more contemptuous with giving small portions of their money away, and growth skyrockets. After some decades of repairing the city’s infrastructure, and then the city’s population is now more than 1 million, the city can now pay for the public works and, with a huge money pool to choose from, can stably tax the population and continue to grow.
Now, as long as the city doesn’t focus its excess money on something stupid; like a horrible immigration plan, or multiple social programs that, statitically, have been proven to fail, be ineffective, or be too expensive; then everything will be fine.

Legalize but Regulate Pornography

(Author’s note: the reasoning for even mentioning this is simply because ponography has such a strong attachment to our society today. End of author’s note.)

Now, it may come as a shock to some of you reading, but pornography does have some societal benefits to it, besides the massive economic boons from the industry and pursuing hedonism without going out your way to harm someone. When it comes to the youths, it can provide the entertainment to prevent them from becoming unwedded mothers and fathers, and the inexperienced and the uneducated, the needed knowledge to perform with, and treat their partners correctly, if given the right content for it. Those sexual education and health videos they teach you in school can, after all be considered ponographic content, since they teach the viewer the importance of sexual reproduction and the primary functions of both the male’s and female’s body parts.

Not only is it beneficial for education, but it can also be used to curb some of the more morally questionable forms of employment, such as prostitution. World statistics have shown that in areas where pornography is illegal, those

countries; China being one as an example, have seen a dramatic spike in prostitution, illegal sex trafficing, and illegal smuggling of pornographic material, whereas countries that let it be legal, like the United States, have seen drops of these same crimes and undesirable jobs over the past few decades, since pornography became more widespread in the 80s, thanks to home video access and gradual decensorship.
However, there is a catch. Not all things coming from the legalization of pornography is necessarily good. Some aspects of it have shown to deteriorate certain parts that are necessary for human progress and advancement. Once such example is that pornography has been one of the leading factors in declining birth rates, since people have the access to the pornagraphic content, many just simply stop going out of their way to interact with the opposite sex, since their sexual frustrations can simply be solved by turning on a telephone, television, or computer monitor and…. you know. Another such example is that it's been proven to cause people to become more unwilling to interact with others romantically, causing them to become more reclusive and less likely to form lasting relationships, many simply lose interest and, in tern, have displeasurable marriages, which often

end shorter than those in countries where pornography is illegal, since the importance of wishing to rely on one’s partner for their sexual appetite can simply be solved from pornography, people whom often use sex as a reason to stay married (not all marriages are out of love you know) simply divorce and not have to worry about it. Now, in cases where the relationship was horrible even with the sex, that’s understandable. But in most cases, people who marry are often happy or at least satisfied with their marriage, and if pornography is what allows one to ascertain sexual pleasure without physically needing to do it themselves, then the marriage is in danger as the bond between the spouces *may* be ruptured due to uncontrollable outside forces.

So, perhaps the answer to this, you may ask, is simply to regulate it. As previously mentioned, outlawing it will not bring good fortune to the country as outlawing it, though yes raises the birthrate, forces people to have longer lasting marriages, and to go out of their way to physically interact with one another. It also however spikes the illicit spreading of pornographic content, sex slave trafficing, pedophilia, and prostitution. Humans are not always obedient creatures, simply restricting these pleasures and instinctual desires

will only force them to pursue them anyways and clog up the jail and prison systems with unnecessary mouths to feed, clothe, and house, and no,
simply legalizing it completely will not help either, as doing so will allow for the more sick twisted fetishes such as pedophilia and sex slavery to become widespread and rampant. Doing so would, yes prevent children from becoming premature parents, but doing so will also allow them to pursue other acts of hedonism unrestrained, stunting mental progression and spiking degeneracy. Therefore, a fair regulation of pornographic content is best suited to prevent both the rising of illegal trafficking and prevent improper education and premature/premarital births, and prevent all the other bad things without wrecking everything in the process. Perhaps restrict the dvd, but bolster the theater? Keeps those pesky discs away from the children, that's for sure. Now, what about those dirty magazines and books? Keep them locked away in a room somewhere or just don't buy them at all. What of your "objects"? If you buy em, definitely lock'em away somewhere, especially if you're a married man or woman. As for the more actually sick things, make sure those are kept in a

vault somewhere and only kept for the owners' prying eyes.

Institute Biofuel Production

The modern world is changing and the world around it is always being altered to suit our needs, however, this comes with a price. Pollution is a natural outcome of environmental shifts and a natural part of human evolution and enginuity, but like all things, if not properly treated or changed properly to fit in the environment, the pollution ends up soiling the lands, waters, and structures we humans construct, consume, and cultivate, and with pollution comes also a price of another kind: an exhaustion of resources. Resources needed to power our ever onward expanding and aging world as well as the people that reside in it. In our world, the two resources we run on the most to power our world are Oil and Coal. Petroleum oil is often

extracted from the ground and synthesized into liquid and chemical substances used for a plethora of things, the most obvious being plastic for small and large materials and gasoline to power our cars, trucks, and planes, with some instances for trains(although electric and diesel are the most common), and coal being used by 90 percent of the United States electrical grid as fuel for our power plants.

Oil in particular is a heavily used resource, It's everywhere, is widely exported by much of the world, and imported by its biggest consumers. In some ways, oil is even more valuable than gold itself, however, oil is not an infinite resource. All resources are finite, and with how heavily used oil is, its reserves are depleting quickly. Resource staticians say that there is only enough oil to last us until 2050 and that the current consumption and rise of population may just hasten it an extra few years if we aren’t careful. Some have proposed an absolute overhaul to try and solve this problem, like how it was explained in Congress woman; Alexandria Ocasio Cortez’s Green New Deal and by the thunderously boisterous Greta Thundburg. Although their hearts might be in the right place, their minds and foresight are strongly not, as the kind of overhaul they are proposing would have a

multitude of problems concerning the economy, civilian population, and; ironically; the environment itself, as overhauling everything to such an extreme degree would not only be damaging to the countries and people it would be made to help, but also would cause the environment to dramatically shift to attune itself with the overhauling. The animal life would be largely displaced due to having their fragile habitats so hastily tampered with that they wouldn’t be able to adapt quickly enough to the surge in human development. The fawna being used to the slowly changing atmosphere would likely die off as the sudden change in the air and weather would cause ecological concerns that the plant life wouldn’t be able to adapt to.

Most of all, the combination of both problems would cause a sudden shift in the human environment, as the ecological problems would likely cause crop failure and domesticated animals would likely be unable to properly adjust to the new environment, making many animals either die due to the sudden shift, or suffer in the process as the farmers wouldn’t be able to properly feed many of their livestock.

With the kind of overhaul they have insisted we do, along with the various economic policies as

expressed in the Green New Deal, it wouldn’t be ludicrous to assume that what both of them have proposed is or could be essentially an eco-friendly variation of Stalinism. For those unaware, Stalinism is a variation of socialism in which the state must technologically advance and industrialize no matter the cost, even if it means slavishly working its own civilians in order to achieve that particular goal, and when you look at the aspects of the Green New Deal it almost seems like an ecology friendly version of Stalinism given that it says we must retrofit every structure and vehicle network within the next 10 years, regardless of the actual monetary cost of it all, which in the G.N.D., it says that the estimated cost would be around Ninety Trillion(90,000,000,000,000) dollars.

The insane price alone is enough to make any sane man or woman gasp.

So, the answer to potentially solving all these problems is not through major and expensive overhauls. Much like gambling and economics, you shouldn’t bet everything in one go just for a small chance to win big, you’d be better off making many smaller gambles and investments and eventually you’ll rack up more profit over time.

To start out, in order to prevent ourselves from continuously depleting our oil supplies, we must

begin work on constructing some bio-fuel farms and synthesizing facilities. Corn and Algae, if synthesized, can become great combustible material. Corn is a widely used and cultivated crop, and can be found in virtually every super market, farmers market, grocer, and restaurant. Algae, on the other hand, is found in virtually any place where there's water, and like corn, can if collected be synthesized into a combustible material (author's note: fun fact, it can also be consumed too and provide the body with lots of proteins and enzymes. The Aztecs actually did this heavily since meat was not always a readily available resource). Now, the actual cost of a facility is not readily available information, so based on an educated guess, the cost of a single bio-synthesizing facility would perhaps be around 100,000 to 500,000 dollars per every small or medium sized facility, though again, this is an educated guess, not definitive fact so it could be much cheaper or much more expensive, regardless, as long as we start small and steadily work up a sizable fuel storage, we can allow for cars to remain operable. As for how we ascertain the funding for production, it will either have to be done by federal or local funding via taxes or by fundraising off of private interest, or perhaps a mix of both depending on what

resources are available and need to be ascertained to keep production moving depending on how much staff is needed to keep things running smoothly. Given that these are technically scientific facilities, these facilities would obviously need to be staffed by college/trade school educated professors and doctors, with exceptions for low-ranking personnel such as warehouse staff, packagers, and CDL drivers, depending on the pay rate of each facility, though that will have to depend on each facility and how many staff it can afford to allow for production.

After a few years of constructing these facilities and synthesizing the various biofuels, such as the previously mentioned corn and algae, we then proceed to construct more facilities over time and *gradually* push upward, so as not to upset anything without causing a major economic or ecological cataclysm.

After the first few months, bio-fuel production begins, we then should focus on manufacturing bio-fuel automotives. Since this major task will be quite an expensive one to fund, it would be a suggestion to allow for major corporations and shipping companies to be given the cheapest access to these bio-fuels for a reasonably lengthy time, so as to gain support from them and to

ensure that usage of bio-fuel becomes more widely used. After all, no businesses travel farther and faster than the U.S. mail system and Amazon.

Institute Fuel Efficient Automotives

Similarly to the previous topic, the modern world is experiencing a resource depletion that is only steadily getting more and more worse over time,

and part of the reason why that is, is because of how fast we humans are consuming those resources. Oil, being one of the most consumed resources, is naturally the resource being depleted the quickest. The most major reason being why that is is because of our fuel usage from automotives. Only recently, cars are being made to have a fuel efficient motor where a tank of gas could last 100 miles(or 160km), but the majority of Americans still buy, sell, and trade older vehicles, many of which still having their original engines or engines installed in the 90,s when fuel efficient cars were still a rarity. To try and ease this resource problem, it would be beneficial that we, as Americans, try to help by refitting cars, both new and old, to be more fuel efficient. However, there is a bit of a concern for this issue, as to replace an engine will cost as much as 3,000 to 4,000 dollars, with new cars having a price as high as 7,500 dollars to have an engine be fully replaced, and considering that many Americans don’t typically keep much money in the account, it wouldn’t be too hard to understand that such a thing would be a burden. however, this is not to say that automotives that do not fit underneath a certain limit will not just be confiscated, nor will the owners of said vehicles be fined or imprisoned for

it, rather if someone is not capable of affording a new engine replacement, then one can simply ask for their car to be traded in for a more fuel efficient car of the same value as their current car, this way, people with financial situations in which they cannot afford such a thing can be given an automotive that is fuel efficient and of similar or better quality (this depends on whether the car is in decent condition) than the car they had traded in to receive the engine change. However this is not to say that such a thing is immediately guaranteed as there are over 300,000,000 Americans, and the average cost of a used car is 20,084 dollars, based on 2018 estimates, and 36,718 dollars for a new car, based on 2019 estimates. Likely, the majority of Americans will not be able to immediately benefit from this sort of program, as to do so would cost a dramatic amount of money in order to do so, which is especially draining on the car industry, as a whole, as I'm very much sure Ford or Chevrolet don’t have hundreds of millions of fuel efficient motors locked away in cold storage. So similarly to the previous subject, it would be best if the process took a slow push forward and gradually made fuel efficient cars more widespread, or just simply tell Americans to save up some enough to afford a new engine

change. Either way, if it makes cars more fuel efficient then all is good.

Fairly Regulate Internet Activity

We are men & women of the modern era, the space age, the age of information. As such we live in an age of unparalleled innovation, just waiting to be grasped and attained. However, such achievements come with a price. A price so great that even the greatest of civilizations are at risk of total and utter collapse at its might if left unchecked, of course I am talking about the might of the Internet.

For years, the internet has played an integral part of our daily lives. First was when it was created as a United States communications network for the military, to now as an international communicator. Since its rise, it has lead to many great things. It has built businesses, strengthened organizations and communities, and has influenced and spread ideas and religions alike. However, when left unchecked has left a trail of horrors in its wake. Mass hackings, spikes in online bullying, harassment, and depression, and illegal information gathering; a.k.a. Doxxing. A form of regulation so as to not to allow such terrors to happen is not just needed, but necessary to ensure that all people do not get harmed, and that all

powers, parties, and entities of some kind don’t also become too powerful and criminalistic.
As from what we’ve seen from companies like google and facebook, and even notable news entities like C.N.N. only taking and/or stealing & exploiting our private and identifiable information without the permission of the person they’re taking the information from, such as the case with Nicholas Sandmann during the Covington Catholic debacle. In doing so, they have hostilly invaded Sandmann’s privacy and the Sandmann family so hard that they have received death threats, and threats of violence for nearly 2 years, all in the pursuit of ascertaining more wealth, which ended in a total backfire with them having to pay out a tremendous settlement after a high profile lawsuit.
Proper regulation of the internet via government mandate is a necessity in today’s modern world, so as to protect and empower those at the bottom and prevent those at the top from invading our private home networks and personal lives.
Now, how great that regulation should be is anyone’s guess, but surely as long as we make it decently regulated so as to make sure such catastrophes like the Covington case do not happen again is something we must take into consideration. By a suitable guess, It would be

most beneficial to us all if at least Fifteen 15% of the internet be regulated to prevent such things like that from happening again.

Incentivise Market investment with Low Taxes

It’s a tale as old as human civilization itself, as society grows, it becomes richer, and then the society’s head honchos’ decide they could get a good buck out of this if they learned just how to keep it coming. Welcome to the world of business and finance, as they’d probably say. Ever since the concept of the market came to be, marketing became taxable, and ever since marketing became taxable, so did one’s goods, but at a much larger scale than at just the local level. No longer were pots and plants the only goods sold at the marketplace, now large and exotic goods ranging from jewelry and clothes to cars and mobile-homes are sold at the market.

But then the Three most important questions of marketing are asked.

1) How much of the good is available?
2) How long will the good be available for?
3) How affordable will it be?

If the market tax is high, then by the law of natural order, so too will be the price of goods. For an example, let’s use bread.
At the average store, a single loaf of bread is usually priced at around 1 to 2 dollars. In a place where the tax rate is high, that normally cheap loaf of bread would have a much higher price range, let’s say that the price of a loaf in a high tax area is worth 4 to 5 dollars per loaf. That kind of pricing for general store or dollar store bread would drive anyone not of working class or not insane with anger if the price were that high. Now instead of bread, let’s say a cell phone.
At the phone store or superstore the average price for a cell phone is usually priced around 90 to 200 dollars, but with a sudden tax increase, that phone you bought or were thinking of buying likely costs 50 percent more than it previously did, making both phones 125 dollars and 300 dollars each. Now, let’s say it went up 100 percent. Now that touch screen you were going to buy or thought of buying now cost between 180 dollars and 400 dollars to buy what the store calls its cheapest and most inexpensive phones. Such a thing would’ve made sense 10 years ago, when touch screens were relatively new and really expensive, but by today’s standards, no one who wouldn’t have more

than 100 dollars in their wallet or bank account would do such a thing as such a thing would drive us away from the store unless seen as needed or necessary, and since most don’t even have 100 dollars to spare, it wouldn’t be surprising that those phones wouldn’t sell. History has shown that if a country’s tax rate grows too high, then so too will its price of goods and poverty rates. An example of this would be what had happened in Ireland during the Irish potato famine.

Part of why the potato famine went so tragically was because of the poor marketing skills of Sir Charles Trevelyan, an English lord who thought that the reason people often became poor was not because of financial hardships and mismanagement, but rather due to moral failures. He believed that, because the Irish were technologically behind and still practicing a barter system, and still practitioners of Catholicism, that they then must’ve been lazy and unmotivated, when, in fact, they were far from that. Trevelyan believed that if he could teach the Irish a form of Anglo-Saxon capitalism, that which we’ll call Trevelyanism (since he never gave it a name), then the irish would be better off and not need to rely on foreign intervention. However this did not help nor enrich the Irish.

Charles’s form of capitalism focused on intentionally raising prices at stores, raising taxes, and banning cheap goods from places like the United States. He believed that doing so would drive market investment by the other, richer countries of the world, as the high prices would mean to them that more people would be willing to buy their goods as higher prices meant richer customers. However, this had the complete opposite effect, as merchants knew that usually, where there were higher prices, there were usually high tariffs as well, so as a result, many merchants often went nowhere near Ireland. Instead, they went to the United States, where prices were cheap and tariffs were low. Charles also, due to his beliefs, thought of giving less to the Irish due to the previously stated belief of ‘moral’ failures. Charles believed that the path to industrialization, a wealthy nation, and a better life was from the hands of Protestantism. He, along with many lords of England at the time, believed that the Irish’s faith in Catholicism was the main reason why they were in such a dilemma to begin with, and as such, many Irish were not allowed in office or allowed to contribute to society as a whole unless they were Protestant, so rather than helping the Irish, Charles and his failed form of capitalism, led to price hikes

and famine, all stemming from his poor insight, lack of proper marketing skills, poor management of wealth and resources, and ideological beliefs, thus resulting in millions dead and millions more fleeing, mostly illegally, to other countries. Another case of this is Weimar Germany's economy. A country filled with natural resources, industries, and economic centers like that, you'd have to be an idiot to mess up. Normally, this would be the case, but in Weimar Germany's case, this ended up being a bit more complicated. The Weimar republic was created by the fragments of the old German empire. After the economic disparities brought on by WWI and the war reparations the Germans were forced to pay following their defeat, the Germans, having a notably bad history with Democracy/Republicanism before the war, as the history of Germany showed, ended up faring poorly for them. The politicians whom were used to the top-down monarchical system now had to squabble with each other to keep things afloat. New concepts were both willingly and forcefully introduced, because of all the parties and the constant fighting, the German parliament ended up being bogged down by ideologically driven problems, most of which about how the government should be run, and little on

how the country needed to be run, thus resulting in many politicians, due to their ideological in-fighting, ended up mismanaging the economy, raising the tax rate, mismanaging the market, and ultimately resorted to printing out more money than they had resources to back said money in to pay for their increasing debt, resulting in hyper-inflation, and the eventual rise of an Austrian man whom, through being democratically elected, became the ever hated dictator of Germany. That man being Adolf Hitler.

Our final example is Zimbabwe. Following Weimar Germany's footsteps, the Zimbabweans tried to sort out their financial situation by simply printing more money than they had resources to back the money up. How this situation occurred is surprisingly more along the same lines of North Korea. Like North Korea, Zimbabwe experienced its financial downbringing, not from ideologically driven motives or from war, but rather because of mismanagement of the economy by the country's leaders, and by a decaying infrastructure that wasn't able to keep up with the rest of the world or be easily replaced. To put it simply, the Zimbabwean leadership got too ahead of themselves, and it all came crashing down. Now it

costs millions for a loaf of bread and, god knows what, for a pair of shoes.
Truly, after all these examples that have been given out, it goes without saying that high taxes and improper management will result in poor economies and price hikes. After all, just ask California. To put it simply, as long as the tax rate remains low, the market flow will increase exponentially and the economy will flourish with few hindrances, and what few hindrances that come up can easily be dealt with, if placed into the hands of competent people and not into the hands of someone who will waste time, money, and resources on something like healthcare to illegal immigrants, or ludicrous social policies for made-up sexualities. Remove those hindrances, and you will have an economy not 100 percent ideologically driven and 80 percent less likely to fail.

Mandate 1 year of Military Service

Throughout history, the call to arms has always been made in times of crisis. Boys become Men, girls become Women, and children grow up knowing that their parents served their country. In today’s world, our boys and girls are not becoming Men & Women as they should be.

Slowly but surely, they are becoming more and more undisciplined, and the school system in need of reform is not entirely to blame.

Part of why our kids are not growing up is because the parents are not disciplining our youths properly. Children from our grandparents' times knew how to speak and behave in a respectable manner, and remain focused when both learning in school and learning life skills. Nowadays, kids learn nothing valuable but to curse when engaging in an argument, which even then offers no real benefit. Not even to those crybaby social justice fakers, that often use cursing and tirading as their main vocal point. What has happened to this country of ours?

Where people literally die in the streets, and it is the trauma of a transexual person that makes frontline news. Why is it that so many of our people are growing up poor and childless? Why is it that many cannot find work for simple jobs and many quit when it starts to get, "too hard"? Our society today is undisciplined and needs to shape up. Look at Israel, Russia, Switzerland, and Austria. All 4 of which are countries with a law stating that all must serve the military for at least 1 year after graduating high school, many of its civilians whom are sent in for service often come out disciplined

and prepared for the world. Russia alone should be a good example as to why we should mandate this as they’re often called America’s military equal. Aside from disciplinary action and military prowess, allowing for 1 year of military service can also provide the people who are soon to be young adults opportunities and openings for work experience. The military is always a place for a possible career path, as it not only provides people with knowledge on self defense, or how to properly use and wield a firearm, but it also provides people with the opportunity to work on, repair, and operate machinery and computer technology, not all of which were designed for warfare. Why, it wouldn’t be surprising if many computer technicians found good places at Microsoft or Apple, and many vehicle engineers at Ford automotives or Chevrolet. Its very likely many found great employment in civil services, such as the police force. All those retired personnel likely became good teachers in some way. Many jet pilots likely went on to become great commercial jet pilots.

So why send our children into the outside world unprepared and undisciplined when we can have them leave to the army and comeback with proper learning and working skills? With all the examples

given, I’d say it would benefit us Americans greatly.

Raise the Federal minimum wage to 10 dollars.

I know what you’re thinking. A 10 dollar minimum wage sounds too high for some and too low for others. People today are asking for a 15 dollar minimum wage and the ones protesting this are saying that the economy will crash and burn if that were to happen. As much of an exaggeration that is, they aren’t entirely wrong. In the year 2019 the U.S. government had collected nearly 3.5 trillion dollars.

If we were to calculate how much the current minimum adds up and how much it contrasts from the 15 dollar minimum then we might just see the bigger picture in everything.

First take the current federal minimum wage of 7.25 and multiply it by 8(as in the 8 hours of a work day) and you’ll get 58. Then multiply 58 by 7 (as in the 7 days of a week) and you’ll get 406. Now multiply that by 52 (as in the 52 weeks in a year) and you’ll get 21,112. Meaning that at the current federal minimum wage, one will make 21,112 dollars each year. Now take the proposed 15 dollar minimum wage. Multiply that by 8 and you’ll get 120. Now multiply that by 7 and you’ll get 840, and multiply that by 52 and you’ll get 43,680. Meaning that at the end of each year, a person would receive 43,680 dollars at the end of a year if their minimum wage was 15 dollars. On the

other hand, a business would also have to pay 43,680 dollars each year to each of its employees if the federal minimum wage was raised to 15 dollars. Now this would be a great thing and make sense if the company we were talking about is a massive conglomerate with millions of dollars in its possession. However, most companies in the United States are largely small time shops that’re family owned and often only make enough money to keep the business functioning. A business, when bought or built, could’ve been worth 50 thousand dollars when it first started, but that doesn’t mean that the owner of said business has an extra 50,000 in their bank account, or is highly successful. Oftentimes, many businesses shut down due to lack of funding, or due to a lack of proper circulation to allow the business to keep going as such, has limited funding and therefore a limited pool of money to afford to give to its employees.

Let’s say that you are the owner of a small shirt factory with 30 employees. At the current federal minimum wage you’d have to pay each employee 21,112 dollars, multiply that by 30 and you’d in total have to pay them all 633,360 dollars at the end of each year. Let’s say your factory makes 1.5 times that much which when multiplied comes to

950,040 dollars, at the current federal minimum wage, the factory’s production output gives it slightly over 950,000 dollars each year, subtract the 633,360 dollars each year you need to give to pay your employees and you’re left with 316,680 dollars, now let’s say it needs to pay 75,000 dollars for repairs and maintenance yearly, subtract that and you’ll get 241,680 dollars, now subtract the yearly electrical cost which we’ll say is another 90,000. That leaves you with 151,680 dollars. now subtract the cost of the factory’s yearly plumbing, which we’ll say is 30,000 dollars, you’d be left with 121,680 dollars. Finally, subtract the amount of money it needs to pay the truckers each year to deliver and send out the textiles needed for the shirts in the first place, for this scenario we’ll say 30,000 dollars, then finally, you’d be left with a total of 91,680 dollars, meaning that throughout all of your small factory’s cost to pay its employees and the cost of maintenance, plumbing, electrical bills, and shipping and handling, you are left with only a little over 91,000 dollars in your small factory’s profit. Under the current minimum wage, your small business is able to give you 91,680 dollars in total at the end of each year to save up or spend.

Now place in the 15 dollar minimum wage. With the 15 dollar minimum wage, you are now to double each and every one of your employees paycheck. The cost of everything stays the same but the employees you have to pay now double what you used to yearly pay them, so take 43,680 and multiply it by 30 and you'll get 1,310,400 dollars, your factory's output only makes 950,000 dollars each year and cannot afford to pay that much for that many people. Even if you were to forgo the 91,000 you'd make as profit, you'd only get 1,040,680 dollars leaving you with a 230,000 dollar deficit, so in order to pay for such a thing you'd have to take the most logical course of action or else face your company shut down; fire a portion of your company's staff in order to pay for the higher wage increase.

Let's say you fire 10 employees, by firing those 10 employees, you've removed 1/3rd of the amount of money you'd need to pay yearly to your employees. Which means you'd have to pay 43,680 dollars yearly to 20 employees, which comes to 873,600 a year. Due to the factory firing 10 employees, the remaining employees have to work harder for the same hourly pay to keep up with the factory's current output to pay for everything and give it a profit, your company only

makes 950,040 dollars every year and needs to still pay for all of the other costs the factory needs to stay active, which when all added together, come to a cost of 225,000 dollars. Add that to the yearly amount of money you need to pay everyone and you'll have to pay a total of 1,098,600 dollars each year for paychecks and bills. Since your factory only makes 950,000 dollars, it'd be left with a 140,000 dollar deficit in order to pay for everything. So then, the only logical course of action then is to fire more employees to keep up. Let's say you fire 5 more people, now half of all your staff are gone and the remaining staff now must work twice as hard for the same hourly payment since half of the staff was fired to pay for everything, and the amount of money you'd have to pay each employee is 655,200 dollars each year. Add the yearly maintenance costs and you'll get 910,200 dollars. Each year your small factory needs to pay 910,200 dollars out of the 950,040 dollars it receives in order to pay for everything. Leaving you and your factory with 39,840 dollars left in profit.

Under the current federal minimum wage, your company would've been given an annual profit of 90,000+ dollars each year, had a full employment base, and your employees would only have to work

the needed amount to keep the factory active, however, with the minimum wage now being 15 dollars an hour, your factory now has to pay more money leaving you with a nearly 2/3rds smaller money pool to profit from, every employee now must work 2 times as hard in order to receive the same hourly work, and would have only a half-full employment base, leaving you and the company with less money, less employees, and with more work to pay for the 15 dollar minimum wage you need to pay those same employees.
So here’s what should be proposed; instead of a 15 dollar minimum wage, we instead make it a 10 dollar minimum wage. Take 10 and multiply it by 8 and you’ll get 80, multiply that by 7 and you’ll get 560, multiply that by 52 and you’ll get 29,120, meaning that with a 10 dollar minimum wage, being only an increase of only 2.75 dollars, the minimum wage would only affect a small percentage of the profit the factory makes. 29,120 times 30 would equal 873,600, meaning that, for only a small increase of 2.75 dollars, the company would have to pay the same amount of money it would’ve had to pay for if it had to fire 10 people, meaning that the company’s production output stays the same, no worker has to be fired or be made to work twice as hard for the same

payment, and the company on annual would receive a profit of 76,440 dollars each year, only reducing the yearly profit by a sum of 15,000 dollars.
Apply all of this to every small time U.S. business and low income area, and you'll see that the employment rate won't spike dramatically nor will employees be forced to work twice as hard, and yes most people will be guaranteed a living wage. Not all people sadly as there's never going to be a 100 percent perfect economy.

Invest in Alternative Energy Sources

Throughout the modern world, there has been one resource that has always been in high demand. No, not oil; no, not gold, and definitely not water. No, none of those. The one resource in which I am referring to is Electrical Energy. Electricity, since its capability of being harvested, had been an always on-demand resource, being a necessity needed for everyday lives.
Once originally used for simple lighting and basic lines of production, such as sowing, is now the most widely used resource, apart from that of food and drinking water and encomposes everything

from crop planting, to entertainment, to governance, and to even our everyday lives. Without electrical energy, we as humans in our world today, would not have the same massively connected and complicated systems of life and civilization we have today. Without electricity, we'd be unable to use essential parts of life from the internet, to the cars we drive, and to the heating and cooling devices we have in our homes and refrigerators. Truly, without the advent of electricity, the world we'd live in would be very different.

However, in this world that is ever changing, the sources of which we are able to attain our electricity are critical to not only our lives and infrastructure, but also to our environments and the air we breath. Throughout the continental United states, our main source of attaining electricity is through coal-fueled steam power. Boilers filled with burning coal and connected to a series of air-pressure pumps and pistons, all of which connected to a turbine, and to keep the excess smoke from overloading the system, the rest of the smoke is let out via a large set of smoke stacks which spew smoke and other harmful chemicals into the atmosphere. Typically, when alternative forms of electricity are proposed people

would speak of introducing solar power or wind power, although clean sources of energy, multiple solar panels or wind turbines combined are not capable of producing the same degree of wattage as a single coal plant, a single house in the year of 2019 required 914 watts for 1 month, nearly 1 Megawatt(1,000 watts) per month, and a single solar panel and wind turbine both only produce 250 watts each, meaning that you'd need 4 solar panels or 4 wind turbines, or 2 solar panels and 2 wind turbines to power a single household for at least 1 month. Now apply that to an entire city of at least Ten Thousand and you will have to erect Forty Thousand solar panels or wind turbines or Twenty Thousand each in order to power every household. The benefits of reducing carbon emissions would be great, but there would be many more problems with this than benefits to allow for such a choice to be possible. The most notable being the severe reduction in space available to build all the panels and turbines needed for the city to use. Another would be the expensiveness of it all, as 1 solar panel cost around 20,000 dollars to set up. The amount needed to erect 40,000 would estimate to be 800,000,000 dollars or 400,000,000 dollars for twenty thousand. As for wind turbines, a single turbine is estimated

to cost between 1.3 million to 2.2 million dollars to install, meaning it would cost between 52 and 88 billion dollars to install 40,000 turbines or 26 billion and 44 billion dollars for 20,000 turbines. The cost of a single coal plant is estimated to be only 2 billion dollars.

The second most notable problem of this is the accessibility of the power source's fuel source. In order for a power source to generate electricity, it must have its own energy source in order to power the turbines or store electricity. In order for a solar panel to work, it must have sunlight, and in order for a wind turbine to work, it must have air-movement to turn its propellers.

Typically, the place where its most beneficial to use solar panels is the desert, since there's little precipitation to allow for clouds to block out the sun, but the problem with this is that in order to properly maintain these panel grids, we'd need to have a significant amount of specialists and electricians nearby to work on, repair, replace, and maintain these panels to make sure that they'd remain functional. Doing so would require lots of resources, especially when it comes to things like housing, nourishment, and sanitation, which means that the country would have to spend massive amounts of money creating small cities just for

technology experts and repairmen and women to reside in, which by anyone’s guess would mean spending tens of millions to hundreds of millions of dollars more just to build and maintain the infrastructure needed to power all of the solar panels and wind turbines necessary to power a small city.

How many homes for this is a wild guess, but it certainly would be a significant amount for this to happen. As for wind turbines, the best place is typically in large open expanses such as the ocean or areas with high elevation. Since wind turbines require a significant amount of spacing between each other, they wouldn’t be much of a problem… at first. However, since windmills require an area where air-motion is plentiful, they’d have to be placed in areas that would be hundreds of yards apart from each other in order for them to maintain a constant air flow.

Doing so would mean having to allocate a significant amount of land away from urban centers in case one were to break/fall down. Not only this, but would, in the process, have to be placed in an area where likely there are lots of farms nearby, meaning we’d have to allocate some of a farmer's land away from them in order to set up a few turbines nearby. Causing some, if not

many, farmers to become disgruntled by this action and may even protest or attempt to shutdown the operation of said turbines if, unless decently and rightfully compensated. Another problem to occur is the aforementioned spacing issue, as a cluster of windmills can only cover so much ground, and in order for a singular amount of windmills to be erected, they'd have to be spread around and into surrounding areas to erect so many windmills, which means windmills would likely have to be placed in areas such as other surrounding towns, cities, and villages in order to cover the amount of ground it needs to be built. Unless the other towns were fine with this or were fine not receiving power from these turbines, then they'd accept their appearance, however, knowing how people work, if they saw a large power structure nearby not being used to generate some electricity for them, but rather for some city far away they have nothing to do with, then as the locals they are, wouldn't take too kindly to seeing a newly made windmill not providing anything beneficial to them and would and or will likely protest and demand that the windmills give to or siphon off power from the main power grid to their power grids or protest and demand that the windmills be taken down, since they serve no

actual benefit or purpose for them or to them and seeing that the cost of all these windmills would have come out of their tax dollars, many more locals in the surrounding towns and cities would protest even more, seeing that the money was spent on large windmills that only work on windy days, rather than towards something more practical like repaving the roads and revitalizing crumbling infrastructure.

Finally, to top it all off, there is the problem with the environment. Despite the intentions of trying to reduce carbon emissions and air pollution to the environment, doing so would cause a lot of ecological concerns of another kind. Similarly to what was said in the biofuel section, erecting newer infrastructure to try and reduce environmental problems would cause a lot of the local wildlife to drastically change in order to keep up with the human activity. We already have problems with birds flying into jet plane engines, what will happen with all those birds flying into windmill propellers on a massive scale?

But what of the solar panels? So many grazing animals will now have to flee their original homesteads in order to allow the panels to stay active, and what of the farmers and other rural countrymen and women who’ll now have to have

their property be allocated to the panels and windmills? They most surely will protest against this both for the fact that their land shall be seized from them and that the huge sums of money will go to something that in reality benefits very few. We'd also have to deal with the various environmentalists that hate deforestation and mass land cultivation. What will they think when large amounts of land was cultivated to place in solar panels and windmills? My best guess is that they will think negatively of it all.

So this all begs the question. If energy sources like wind and solar power will cause mass problems, then what other sources should be used instead? When looking at the various sources of electricity there are sources like geothermic energy. Iceland, as an example, has just utilized their usage of the volcanic activity to generate electricity all throughout the island and have become energy exporters from it. Yellowstone park is sat on top of a volcano waiting to burst. Place a pressurized turbine on top and you'll be pumping energy like crazy.

Then there is also wave turbine energy. All along the coast of the eastern and western seaboards of the United States and along the lake fronts of the great lakes, there are waves of water swishing and

swashing up and down, birating the coast. Strap a few pontoons to a large crank and let it wave up and down, turning a turbine attached to it, and let it generate electricity. Then there is kinetic electricity. Gather a large number of people or running animals and have them run on large treadmills attached to a battery. There is also magnetized electricity. Taking inspiration from the Oxford Bell, why not make a facility where there is a large chunk of two magnetically charged metals placed next to each other and connected to various rods where it then directs the energy from these two charged metals into storage containers, or make multiple machines of a similar concept doing the same thing. The energy would be mostly clean (there’s still the issue of electromagnetic radiation causing an E.M.P.) and the amount of energy it produces could be long lasting, depending on how well charged the magnetized metal is.
The United States already uses hydroelectric power, why not make more hydro plants along the Mississippi or Saint Lawrence rivers? The Niagara falls plant generates nearly 5 billion kilowatts (4.9 million watts to be exact) of electricity each year, along with the Hoover dam producing 4 billion kilowatts each hour, making it 24 billion kilowatts each day.

If you’re unaware how big that is, a billion watts is as large as 1 gigawatt (or 1,000,000, kilowatts). Meaning that the Hoover dam produces 24 gigawatts each day.

But what of Nuclear power? Contrary to popular belief, nuclear power is actually one of the safest forms of generating electricity, along with one of the cleanest forms as well. Aside from the waste it produces and the potential meltdowns it can lead to, it actually causes some of the least harm to the environment than coal energy does. And on average a nuclear power plant produces around 1 gigawatt of electricity and already powers part of the U.S. electrical grid in 30 states. If not nuclear, then how about Thorium, which requires a fraction of the energy to generate, and causes even less environmental damage than nuclear power?

From looking at the many other sources of obtaining clean alternative energy, it is clear that we as Americans can find a form of alternative energy that can both be environmentally stable and cost efficient, without having to completely overhaul or shutdown the current infrastructure we have keeping everything together.

Replace Tree Paper with Papyrus Paper

Paper. The one resource more important than any other resource on this planet. Despite all other mentions of how previously mentioned resources are very important, this resource is perhaps the most important of them all, for without paper, we as humans would not have been able to pass on the various kinds of information we use both on a daily basis and on long term projects and achievements.

But like all resources, paper is finite and the source of attaining paper is both in high demand and under scrutiny by environmentalists and climate change activists.
Paper for those who don’t know (which t.b.h. would be laughable at this point) comes from trees. Trees take a long time to grow. 10 years to be exact, and, due to rapid deforestation, have become increasingly scarce, especially for more industrialized societies that are growing very big and very fast. As those societies modernize, so too must their ability to attain these increasingly scarce resources.
One such modernizing way to attain a resource is through substitution and or finding alternative sources. One such source I propose we use as an alternative to paper, so to save the trees for other uses, would be to return to using papyrus paper, much like how our ancient ancestors once used. Similarly to how doctors are resorting to using the ancient method of placing maggots inside of flesh wounds to cure people of flesh diseases. Papyrus can be used to fix, or at least lighten, our increasing tree shortages and demand for paper and lumber. Papyrus is very durable and strong, and depending on how well you preserve it, it can last for centuries and even millenia, if preserved.

Papyrus is also a very numerous plant, and can regrow in under a year, which is in complete contrast to trees, which takes on average 10 years to grow.
So not only will papyrus reduce the shortage of trees, it will also rapidly out-produce trees. The only drawbacks are that papyrus is a wetland plant and must soak in clean water in order for it to stick together to make the paper-like material, meaning in order for papyrus to grow properly, it must be placed in a marshy area, and in order to make it stick together, we'd need to have an always clean source of water on hand to make sure it can be made into the paper material. Given that there are not a lot of immediately accessible marsh lands available to the United States except for maybe the everglades, it would be very likely that special flora facilities would be needed to grow enough papyrus plants. The next best options would be to either
A. Create man made marsh lands to grow the papyrus plants.
B. Import papyrus or papyrus paper from another country, such as Egypt, where the papyrus plant is hugely available.
Or C. Take the current wetland areas we already have and issue private contracts to those living on

said wetlands to farm or subsidize the farming of papyrus on their properties.
All in all, however, papyrus paper as an alternative would benefit the United States greatly if we were to ever seek it out as an alternative to paper.

Bolster the online Market

The modern age, a time of technological innovation and social interaction on a scale never seen before the personal computer was invented. In this time we live in the time of the world wide web and the

glories that it provides to us. From mild sources of entertainment, to a treasure trove of information, to social interaction on an international scale. The advent of the internet is in no way small or insignificant, and as such, has had a profound impact on our daily lives, and to some, down to even the smallest interactions. As such, it comes with one glory that we as humans have always had a certain skill for: Commerce and Trade.

That’s right. Perhaps the one thing the internet has benefited humanity the most, aside from entertainment and the access to knowledge, is Commerce and Trade. No longer confined to just the local store down the road, the market place out in the countryside, the supermarket, or mall plaza in the city. Humankind can now make, create, and sell their worldly (and unworldly) goods and services from the world over without having to resort to cataloging services or expensive mailing ventures. From Facebook to Amazon, people world over can simply search for a product they wish to buy and place an order, all without having to physically walk or drive over to the store and go through isle after isle trying incessantly to find the item that they seek. Sometimes it's arguably better to do this in cases when the mobile service is down or to get some physical exercise, but in cases when

one’s time is limited, doing so is a hassle. and a potential waste of someones’ time, especially when they cannot find the intended item or products they’re looking for. Thanks to the internet, no longer does one have to tirelessly look for the rare or difficult to procure product, when all one has to do is take out their credit card, fill in one’s banking information into the shopping application, wait for a necessary prolonged time, and finally they shall, after that time has passed, get the product that one ordered.

The internet has played an epic role in our country’s economy. As of 2019 estimates, it has been recorded to have contributed 2.1 trillion dollars to the U.S. economy. Estimating to be around 10.1 percent of the entire United States GDP. Making it the 4th most profitable form of revenue in the United States aside from Rental and Leasing, Government Administration, Manufacturing, and Real estate.

If we, as the American people, were to capitalize on this field of marketing, surely the American economy would rise to newer heights not seen in our history, or world history for that matter. The United States, if it were to invest in this area of marketing, would become the first e-commerce behemoth in human history. If we were to bolster

the internet economy into becoming a driving force for commerce and trade, forget building a spaceship to mars, let Elon Musk do that for us, instead let us build skyscrapers on mountains and space colonies on the moon! For if we, as Americans, were to bolster the internet economy, the amount of wealth we'd generate would be so great that achieving these feats would be possible in our lifetimes, but only if we Americans work together to piece together the foundations and architecture of the great E-market forum.

Invest in Desalination

Desalination. The process of removing sea salt from ocean water. Desalination is another great innovation of human ingenuity, as it has allowed those in areas that have historically been lacking fresh or clean drinking water the ability to drink from the sea without having to worry about the effects of salt water sickness. Take Israel for example. A small country with 5 desalination plants along the medditerranean coast. Israel, despite being a small mostly desert country, has invested in desalination technology and despite having few natural resources, little arable land to cultivate on, and much less natural water sources to hydrate and fertilize said land has, due to time and effort, become an international exporter of food and water. Its citizens drink well and eat healthy. Through the process of desalination, the country has become a regional economic hub that many surrounding countries, though yes often very hostile to Israel, depend on to feed and hydrate their citizens. Even some of the country's staunchest enemies cannot deny the greatness that the tiny country has achieved through this process. Another example is Australia. Australia, as you all know, is a largely desert continent with few

habitable and arable lands and, as such, has few sources of obtaining fresh water for its inhabitants. Among the six countries of the Australian confederacy, there are only 2 that have enough fresh water sources to rely on without needing desalination, but even then this isn’t enough as most of the time these countries still need to rely on imported water sources to hydrate its people. So to try and make up for this, the decently rich confederacy has resorted to desalination along its southern coasts to allow for its citizens not along popular international water ways to be able to drink the water they so need. Through this method, the australian people are now capable of attaining water without the need to have to import it from far off lands or from potentially nasty sources, and (hopefully) no longer from water filtration systems that remove the water from yucky places.
Through the process of desalination, we the American people will no longer have to disrupt and divert from fragile waterways, such as rivers and streams to help hydrate those living in the more arabian like climate areas of the United States outback, or those living in the sparsely populated communities of the great planes. Doing this, we can help protect the inland wildlife, environment, and help reduce the consumption of the

increasingly scarce fresh water, due to the rise of the human population. While desalination would not yield any immediate environmental benefit or economic stimulation, it would over time be a net gain in times of water shortage crisis and in the event of a major drought, be an alternative source of water consumption, so that we may save the fresh water that we have left to water our crops and revitalize the land to make it much better for farming and land cultivation. Now the actual cost of building a plant is surprisingly small, or at least small when compared to building a coal plant. Based on 2010 estimates it would take around 32 million dollars to build a 2.5 MGD(Mega Gallons per Day) plant and 658 million dollars to build a 100 MGD plant. Currently the United States only has one active desalination plant in the state of California, the Claude Bud Lewis Carlsbad Desalination Plant, which is estimated to be churning out 50 million Mega Gallons per day. However, due to the size and scale of the water pipelines and filtration system the plant utilizes to give water to its citizens,the expensive technology the plant uses to maintain the desalination process, and; as usual; the ever so terribly high property taxes of the state of California, results in the actual cost of building and maintaining the

plant at around 1 billion dollars yearly. Despite the high cost, if we were to factor out the high property taxes of the state of California, it would be likely that the actual cost of maintaining a plant of that size and scale would be around 600 to 700 million dollars annually, perhaps lower if the technology grade was reduced a bit to be more cost effective. Based on an educated guess, it would then place it at around 500 to 600 million dollars annually (this is only a guesstimate however), meaning that if applied to a 100 MGD plant, the plant could produce a far higher level of desalinated water and cost the same amount of that of the Californian plant, but only if the plant was built with significantly reduced technology and pipelining, and built in a state with a rather low property tax rate, such as that of Mississippi or Alabama. Aside from the obvious expensiveness of desalination, there is also the issue of environmental concerns. As desalination has been proven to be a contributor of carbon emissions and would if implemented on a massive scale, cause some significant atmospheric damage, hampering some of the pro-environmentally friendly ideas that have been previously mentioned. Regardless of these factors, when looking at the overall cost of building a plant and the majority of benefits it can provide

than cannot provide, it would indeed be most beneficial to the American people in the long run to invest in desalination technology.

Illegalize 1,000+ dollar rent

Throughout the United States, the cost of housing and the effects of high prices have made it difficult for the average American citizen to scrape a living for themselves, and in areas where the cost of living is so astronomically high that homes built for people that should be for a low income household or low income earner are instead given overly inflated prices to reside in, all in a vain attempt to stabilize the already unstable economy. In areas where population centers number in between either the hundreds of thousands and the millions, house or apartment rental rates could be the borderline between having feasible shelter and homelessness., and in these densely populated areas such as that of Hartford Connecticut, Los-Angeles California, Cincinnati Ohio, and other

places. A decently affordable apartment is all that stands between a household from being on the streets.
For in these places, they all share one thing in common. An absurdly high rental rate. For in each of these cities, the average cost of rent per person is numbered to be around 1,000 dollars or more each. Homes and apartments, which typically are built for a 100 dollar or 500 dollar price range, are intentionally made 2 to 5 times their actual price value to adjust to the price value of the surrounding area. Although basic economics this is, it goes without saying however that forcing a household with a disheveled interior or exterior to be wildly overpriced is no short of economic torture and/or hell on the renter and rentee. Why must one live in a house built for a 200 dollar income household and be forced to pay one grand worth of money that they themselves can barely afford just to live there? A house owner should not have to live in fear that the next paycheck will determine whether or not they, their family, and their pets will live on the street, and all over a house that they can barely at all can even afford. For this I propose that the cost of rent be significantly reduced from the horrifyingly high price of 1000+ dollars to a national maximum of 700 dollars monthly. A

sizably large, but significantly smaller price range that most Americans would be able to afford.

Limit house rent to 300 dollars minimum.

Despite the talk about wishing to make 700 dollars the national maximum, we must also have to talk about the minimum if we are to make this a fair system.

Throughout the United States, the cost of housing; despite it being high in many places and a burden on many more people than places there are to live in; the concept of home rentalship is still one of the country’s main economic driving forces and reducing the price range to allow for more people to have an affordable home to live in, does

however have the great side effect of hampering the economy. A significant reduction in rent, such as proposed in the previous section, would especially affect areas with high income rates and property values. This is especially concerning in places where the rent can range even beyond 1,000 dollars a month. Why, in the state of New York, rent can cost as much as 1500 a month. Reducing it down to a national maximum of 700 dollars would mean that an 800 dollar more surplus that came from house renting will not be severely reduced. Yes, it would help many New Yorkers whom are currently homeless and in desperate need of housing, but it would also have the collateral effect of striking a spear point into the state economy, and anything lower than the 700 dollar maximum would severely hamstrung the economy of states like New York which, have such expensive housing rates, so to prevent this from occurring, it would be most beneficial to make 300 dollars the national minimum amount of money a house renter can charge on its rentee. Why 300 is simple is because anywhere under 300 dollars is where things start to crumble. 300 dollars is essentially the bare minimum of the economy. Barely enough to be considered to be a lot and

barely enough to keep the economy afloat if things go south very fast.
This way the economy can still tax a significant amount of money from the U.S. citizenry without having to worry too awful much about a recession hitting or too much of people revolting because they're incapable of affording the monthly rent, and this amount of money would ensure the landlords a significant amount of money to afford to pay for utility repairs and building maintenance and with the significant reduction in house pricing, it wouldn't be too long for the landlords to fill up on tenants to take up housing space. Doing so would raise the pool of people to tax rent from and satisfy the tenants who'd have affordable housing to continue to live in without fear of being evicted for some time. Especially in these trying times, what with the coronavirus going on.

Limit Open Borders

The world as we know it is scary, and the countries which exist in this world can be scary places, but the one thing that is most scary in this world is humankind itself. Humans have the ability to both

create and destroy. The people that live in this world have the ability to create a path of peace and prosperity as much as they do the ability to destroy it. We, as Americans cannot allow ourselves to trust the world so casually or to allow for those whom come from beleaguered nations with terrible problems to fester our lands. For if we do, then we shall not just be sent men and women with good intentions of starting a new life and living the American dream, but be sent leeches wishing to take our resources, take our wealth, and take our employment, all while giving little if any of it back to the American people should we give them the opportunity to come into our homeland and take what they wish. Inspired by the intelligent thinking of president Donald John Trump, we as Americans if we were to employ a socialist model, must oversee and regulate our borders and accessibility to and from foreign nations both next door and those hundreds and thousands of miles away. We cannot allow for our country to empower or enfranchise those who come here with malintent and the unwillingness to adhere to border customs and regulations needed to keep our country running efficiently and smoothly. Even in the past, there has not been one socialist or even communist country that has allowed for complete

or unregulated open borders between two or more nations, and to think that such an achievement is possible entirely without repercussions is a pipe dream even the staunchest supporters agree is unattainable. Why is it that you think there is border regulation between our own states? For no reason? Certainly not. Border regulation is to ensure that no criminal may enter our lands and that no criminal of our lands may enter the lands of another state or country., and to completely deregulate border security would mean that we'd not only be endangering ourselves by allowing criminals to pass through our lands unrestricted, but also endangering the lives of others by allowing criminals and traffickers alike to pass through our borders however they please without repercussions. Not all people that come through from the other side are necessarily good people and neither are our own whom pass through to the other side. And the same is said for every other country. Regardless of whatever political or economic ideology the country operates by.
So if we were to allow those whom come here with malintent to slip by without restriction, then be prepared to see yourself and the people you know around you to potentially suffer by the hands of the misfortune bringers.

Lower the Substance Use Age to 18

Despite this being a controversial subject, there is some legitimate reasoning behind it. Throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, the subject of substance use has been mired in controversy after controversy either due to our own ignorance on how to properly use or regulate said substances or because of tragedies that occurred due to our careless or misaligned misuse of the various substances we humans use. From consuming radons for thinking it would reinvigorate the body, to outlawing marijuana for thinking it made people go insane and become homosexuals (Yes really. That was an actual concern back in the day), to allowing people to smoke cigarettes and drink alcohol as young as 10 years old and allowing pregnant women to ingest both thinking they were non-harmful to unborn children, to militaristically arming police officers to detain and imprison people for using or possessing even small amounts of an illegal or illegally obtained substance and giving them decade[s] long sentences. Many of said detainees end up being young people or grown but highly stressed men and women. Oftentimes the usage of these various substances are used not because the user or abuser wishes to

just simply break the law or to get that high, In truth there are many reasons why we people consume and use these substances despite knowing what sort of traumas may come with them. For starters, there is the issue of stress. You know the saying, after a hard day's work, it's always nice to crack open a beer and light up a cigar/ cigarette, takes a load off your mind and lets you feel at ease with the amount of work and nonsense you had to endure. Many Americans who've had that kind of day know exactly how it feels. However, what many forget is that the working age starts at 16 and many youngins work almost as much as other young people do party. Yes, its common to assume that because of their youngness that they don't need to use these substances, that they need to focus more on school than smoking a stick or a joint.

Typically, yes you'd be right to assume such things, but as mentioned on a previous subject, the American school system, in recent years, has become jackshit terrible. As previously talked about, rife with discontent teachers and often more reductive than productive education programs, can you remember your child being taught how to use long division? Or how to use a sewing machine? Or

how to grow plants in a garden? Or how to properly use tools in shop class? Can you?
The school system is rife with dysfunctional programs that teach our students nothing, and when they graduate they forget whatever they had learned after 1 week or 1 month post graduation. Statistically, it has been consistently proven that most Americans, after graduating high school, forget what they learned prior to graduation and revert back to using middle school level education. Few schools in America provide decent education that they'll remember after high school graduation. What good will A^2 + B^2 = C^2 bring to a janitor that only cursory glances at a bottle and applies its contents to a dirty surface? Likewise, what good will be brought to a working age young man or women if all they have to look forward to is useless subjects that offer no real incentive and spiteful teachers that just don't care about their jobs except when it gives them their paycheck? When looking at it from an older perspective, when the school system was accurate and teachers actually cared, yes it made sense to restrict access, but now the perspective is modern and in the modern perspective, many teachers hate their jobs and the schools aren't efficient anymore. They're now both just hindrances that the federal government and

state governments refuse to do anything about. Since most schools are ineffective at teaching students proper skills and subjects, students often go to school feeling more stressed that their pointless tests and quizzes will dictate whether or not they get to have a stable job or not once they graduate. As a result of such stress, many of the students will turn to 3 forms of stress relief; Leasure, Lust, and Addiction. Leasure being video games and entertainment, lust being sex between other students or even prostitution, and Addiction being using illicit or illicitly obtained substances such as alcohol, marijuana, opioids, tobacco, or other kinds of substances to relieve them of their stresses.

Aside from school programs and bad teachers, there's also the problem of the school environment as well. Not just the teachers, but also other students as well. American schools have not only deteriorated in educational effectiveness, but also in building and maintaining a healthy school environment as well. Take the anti-bullying campaign 'Stop Bullying, Speak Up' for example. It was a campaign designed to get schools to de-escalate their rising bullying problems but in the process ended up backfiring and causing many more students to become disgruntled with the

program and bully people out of defiance, spiking the cases of school bullying rather than dropping it. Another example is DARE. An anti-drug campaign first started in the early 80s, and for the past 3 decades has been widely supported by schools and parents alike to de-escalate student drug use. However the efforts of DARE ended up backfiring which resulted in spiking student drug use. The reasoning mainly being that teenagers and young adults are rebellious, school life is stressful, and the methods they used were more alienating and humiliating than they were meaningful and cautionary. Insighting students of all ages to become disgruntled with the program and more stressed out from its alienating effects and thus resulting in a spiking in drug usage than a dropping like as how they intended to do.

Which has resulted in many students of all ages resorting to drugs and other kinds of substances to try and help them relax. Yes, there are some that do so to get a high and yes, there are some that are just lazy bumpkisses that want to be lazy all day, but most students are not like either and are simply just stressed or under a lot of emotional anxiety or societal pressure. After all, all those students that were exposed to DARE or S.B.S.U. weren’t there willingly. Many hadn’t have a choice

and were there against their will, even the well behaved students that had never attempted to use or ascertain said substances or tried to bully another student. Making many students who’re already under a lot of pressure from being forced to conform to an already dysfunctional system just makes them want to ingest and consume relaxing substances even more.

Let’s not forget the more problematic students. The school system has traditionally been seen as the unofficial social center for children, teens, and adults alike, and as such when the school becomes dysfunctional, so too does the social center. Throughout America there have been a multitude of schools that have failed to meet the criteria of being a healthy work environment for students, the aforementioned bullying spike being only one such example. The failure of the public school system has also led to failing grades, increase in criminal activity, increase in poisoned minds, and; as mentioned before; a spiking in drugs and illicitly obtained substances. All these factors in mind have also led to many students to adopt such things as part of their normal lives, resulting in many students becoming juveniles and delinquents, rather than the shining examples of youth that we often make them out to be And as such, are more

likely to commit crimes such as substance abuse and possession. With the penalty rate being a high as it is, making a child, teenager, or young adult go to prison for possession of drugs and other kinds of substances will just ruin their lives more than the actual ingestion of the substances that they were arrested for.

So lowering the usage age to 18 will allow for students, children, and young adults alike whom take and ingest the various substances of the world to seek out rehabilitation rather than a lengthy prison sentence.

Doing so brings us to the next subject of the matter.

Decriminalize Substance Use

In America, punishment for substance possession or abuse isn’t the same kind of punishment than it is in more relaxed countries. Even Russia, which has the second largest documented world prison population has lowered its substance use age to 18 and only has around 104 thousand total convictions due to drug charges and the length of a

sentence is at most for any person convicted of a drug charge between 5 to 20 years depending on the severity of the possession and distribution. The only downside being that there could be a fine between 40,000 to 250,000 Rubles. Whereas a sentence in the United States could receive a near life sentence of up to 99 years in prison for even possession of 4 grams or more of any kind of drug, lethal or non-lethal, and a fine of 10,000 dollars with a higher fine of between 100,000 and 250,000 dollars. Both of which only occur if given a lifetime prison sentence, if in possession on a large scale, or in possession of 200 or more grams of any kind of substance. A sentence for possession of between 1-4 grams of any substance can result in a 2 to 20 year prison sentence, with 2 years for possession of less than 1 gram, whereas the same amount of a particular substance compared to Russia would only get you 2 years at maximum. Another example being Germany. In the German criminal justice system, substance abuse is considered to be a very minor crime. With most sentences, except in cases of large scale illegal distributions of any kind of illegal substance, getting you around a 3 month to 1 year long sentence.

In the United States, any man or woman can be charged for a lifetime sentence for even possessing a small dose of at least 5 grams, resulting in ruined lives and damaged psyches. People are placed indiscriminately with felons even more grievous than other drug possessors or distributors. Inmates can expect to be placed in a cell with one who was charged for extortion, rape, assault and battery, murder, pedophila, and other kinds of more violent crimes. Those who go in and leave, often re-enter society with more skills to do more kinds of crime than when they first entered, hardening them to become even more violent criminals than they were when they were arrested for possessing a few grams. Statistically most prisoners have been recorded as being re-offenders. People who spent their days being institutionalized behind bars and broadening their minds to a newer, more horrid horizon.

When they leave after years or decades of being locked up for what many today would now consider a lowly offense, they come out making more havoc than when they had entered, either as a way to make the system atone for its negligence by showing that it has failed to rehabilitate them for their crime, or to demonstrate that because of the system’s negligence that it has failed to

rehabilitate the felon for their misdeed. The penalty for substance abuse in America is high and can be severe, there’s no question about that however, the psychological effects of detaining and imprisoning those whom possess and/or are ingesting said substances are even more severe than the substances themselves. One who goes to jail or prison does not just simply come out a rehabilitated and revitalized person after serving a determined sentence. They have potential to, but most who do enter and leave come out typically more hardened and ready to commit more crimes than when they first entered. Sending a young man or woman to jail or prison for possessing or ingesting too much of a particular substance will not rehabilitate them. Unless the jail or prison is designed to be more kind and caring to its prisoners, which most U.S. prisons and jails are not, then the only thing that the prison or jail will achieve is creating a more violent and hardened criminal at the end of their sentence.

So rather than send our youths to a place that creates more criminals than it rehabilitates, we should instead send them off to somewhere where they can detoxify and truly rehabilitate. Sending them to a prison designed to hold primed murderers and felons will not help them achieve

rejuvenation, it will only harm them more and potentially harm society as a collateral effect.
It is only when they cannot control their impulses or have been found to be distributing substances on a mass scale that hard punishment should be warranted, but not a punishment that results in them being permanently incarcerated. Such a punishment is too harsh, especially in cases of possession of especially lethal substances. Instead, a reasonably long, but not too long incarceration or extensive rehabilitation program should be instead used.

Illegalize Substances That Kill Under 1 Gram

Despite all the talk of the previous 2 subjects of how we should decriminalize drug and substance possession and lower the substance use age, there is, however, the problem of particularly harmful and deadly substances. Fentanyl for one is a very harmful drug. A synthetically created form of opium that has the potential to kill a full bodied human being with only a dosage of about 3.6 milligrams. 1 milligram is 1/100th of a full gram and fentanyl, despite its size, can be both fast acting and a heavy bruiser on the human body resulting in a fast and painful death in a matter of minutes if not treated immediately. Another example is Heroin, another kind of opioid that has been proven to kill a human being when ingesting under 1 gram of a dose. Another example is Podophyllin, a cytotoxic medicine used in treating genital warts. The medically approved limit is 1 milligram, as 2 milligrams or more can lead to a fatal Central Nervous System(CNS) depression where the body’s nervous system relaxes until it breaks down and eventually collapses in on itself. If a substance has been proven to kill a human being in under 1 gram, then we as Americans must

make sure that this substance, unless medically approved and measured, must stay illegal at all costs for if a drug or substance is capable of killing a human being underneath a single gram, then who knows how bad a man or woman would be devastated if they were to be the victim of a substance overdose or substance damage? A tragedy would befall them and be torturous to know that they'd be forced to suffer for the rest of their lives. This is why, rather than throwing our people in jail, we should help them by placing them into detoxifying rehabilitation and make sure that no substance underneath 1 gram ever gets into their clutches or proximity.

How to do so you may ask? Simple. Allow for the production and sale of these same drugs, substances, and other products and penalize manufacturers and pharmaceutical businesses for selling products above the approved limit and then fine the businesses sufficiently for damages incurred by their negligence. Controlling the production of these substances directly or through third party sources via legal restrictions and fining would then ensure that these companies try to make their products as medically safe as possible. And for anyone that still finds themselves requiring help, sponsor an internment or medical retreat at a

rehabilitation ward or facility to allow them to detoxify and heal. Doing so saves time, lives, and energy.

Make 18 The Age of Consent

Modern times. The age of technological innovation. The age of multiculturalism. The age of consensual degeneration. That’s right. The modern era, despite its technological and ideological progression, has begun to mimic history in some degenerative ways. Like the Renaissance era, we embraced logic and reason, newer ideals, and improved technology.

However also like the Renaissance era. We’ve also embraced newer faiths that potentially harm its congregants more than they do help them, become more war like over the years, and have begun to allow our youths to engage in marital affairs at younger than appropriate ages. A man or woman used to wait until he or she was of the right age until thinking of having children or partaking in lustful pleasantries. Now, much like the more regretful parts of the Renaissance, American teenagers and youths are indulging themselves in all kinds of hedonistic acts without so much as a

thought of how doing so could affect them mentally and physically, and their futures.

Right now at the local level, states are already ratifying laws saying that people at the age of 16 or 17 are allowed to be within a sexual and/or romantic relationship with a grown adult regardless of parental permission or of genuine concern of the youth’s mental wellbeing or physical condition. Statistically, it has been proven that a teenage mother is more likely to suffer from mental deficiencies including anxiety, depression, panic attacks, and other forms of distress. Teenage fathers are likely to suffer from similar kinds of distress, leaving both mentally scarred and mired in regret. Don’t think that underaged parenthood is all that causes distress. It has also been statistically proven that sexually active teenagers are more likely to be depressed and attempt suicide.

The lack of mental preparedness adds a huge load of stress onto the teenager. Forcing them to be placed under a heated situation where they must learn to cope with the kind of trauma that came with engaging in sexual activities. Yes, its good at first as is with sex in general, but eventually the teenager, if not given extra special care, will result in the teenager capitulating to their mental

unwellness and become more and more unstable over time, first from minor impairments such as the inability to understand whether or not their decisions were right or wrong to more long term impairments such as the inability to keep a stable romantic, sexual, or platonic relationship, thus not only affecting their ability to keep a romantic or physical relationship, but may also affect their ability to even have a friendly relationship with anyone of the opposite or same sex. With in some of the most extreme cases, same or opposite sex friendships become impossible.
So to prevent our children from becoming mentally scarred and physically impaired due to negligence of human psychology, we must make sure to place and keep the legal age of consent for both sexual AND romantic relationships between 2 people at the age of 18. Lest we create a great calamity resulting in a failed real life human John Calhoun scenario.

Create Bureau of Employment

What is society without occupation? Is it something like people doing their own thing and milling about? Or is it something worse that we just aren’t able to grasp at? Regardless of this question. Occupation is important. Without an occupation to preoccupy one’s time, how is someone to do anything productive and contribute to society? Without an occupation a person will just laze about, become useless, and drain resources that could’ve gone to making something that would benefit everyone far better in the long run. Now the question is no longer what is society without occupation, but what is society when no one can get an occupation? Simple. Its poverty, homelessness, and outsourced commerce. Today, we Americans are suffering from the negative

effects of Dependent Economics. Dependent Economics is where a country or company uses the labor and or materials of another country or geographic location not akin to their location or country. An example is outsourcing labor to another country. An American company decides to open up a factory in another country to make the same goods for a cheaper price. The company, and by extension the country, is Dependent on that factory to make the intended product so it can import it back to America and sell it.
A real life example is of how American companies during the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) agreement had decided to build factories and stores in Mexico and Canada to exploit both countries' people as cheaper sources of manual labor and their local resources as a cheaper source to find raw materials. Doing so ended up depleting available jobs for Americans to work for and depriving many Americans of a job to find. Another example is of how during another similar trade agreement with China, the United States had outsourced cell phone production to China along with medical masks and pharmaceuticals. Doing so deprived many Americans of the ability to find other kinds of stable employment and has contributed to

America's further dependency on other nations to produce finished goods and contributed to America’s shortcomings during the Coronavirus pandemic.

Dependent Economics is best summarized as depending on another person, company, or country for you, your company, or your country’s economic stimulus. It can make one richer, but as collateral damage can also make others poorer.

So to negate the issue of mass unemployment, the country has decided to allow for deregulation to allow for small businesses to kick upwards and expand and try to revoke these free trade agreements that have drained the American workforce of foreseeable employment opportunities. Although good on the part of Americans who need employment and need to get to work, there is however no guarantee that it will necessarily help Americans find a job especially to those who desperately need one but cannot either because of falling too hard on deaf ears or due to mental deficiencies that prevent them from having a suitable job to begin with. But what of the many men and women who fell so hard that they’ve become homeless or had resorted to more criminal efforts to ascertain enough money to keep them and their families afloat? Will they also be able to

ascertain the needed employment despite not having a home or having the decent record that's needed to keep the job that they're applying for? What of today during the Coronavirus? Where so many companies are being forced to shut down, some of which have done so permanently due to being shut down for far too long. Will the companies that are coming back be enough to give Americans looking for work a place to work, despite the fact that many companies are now starting to go under? In these trying times, we must ask ourselves "will this be enough to get things back up or will we have to find alternative means after all?"

The answer to this is vague, as the effects of the Coronavirus and its economic impact have not yet been made entirely clear, but regardless of this question's answer, one thing is clear: that Americans need jobs and need to have access to something to help them find a job, which is why it would be most beneficial that we create a Bureau of Employment. This would make sure that even in cases of uncertainty, everyone can go somewhere to make it easier on themselves when finding work. Like the Federal Rehabilitation Services does for disabled people, the Bureau of Employment should focus on helping people with financial problems to

find a suitable job that they can work with and accommodate for. The Bureau, however, should not be a guaranteed offer. Like what had happened in Venezuela, guaranteeing everyone a form of employment just made everything unnecessarily complex and expensive, which became one of the biggest financial burdens on the country, thus contributing to the country's decline and turning it into the economic mess that it currently is.
Doing this will allow for the Bureau to do its intended purpose without running into the problem of unneeded bureaucracy and the problem of a potential financial disturbance great enough to hemorrhage the economy. Creating the bureau will ensure that Americans in need of work will be granted access to a program that will try its best to help people in need of a decent job, but cannot ensure that each and every one will have a job. Doing so will turn into a Venezuelan like scenario and cause financial hell on the system and economy as a whole. So as long as this problem is negated, then the bureau will help millions of Americans everywhere even in times of crisis. Not 100 percent as that's impossible, but efficiently enough to make sure that people can find a job.

Create Bureau of Agriculture

In our modernizing world, things such as organization and regulation are now becoming ever more present and a part of our daily lives. From labor unions to mandatory public school services, the United States of America is without a doubt becoming more and more complex. With such

complexities, it then comes with a need to keep things moving as orderly and efficiently as possible and, as such, organizations begin to appear to fill the managerial void that is created after society has grown to where it requires more knowledgeable and labor intensive leaders to oversee everything.

As such, this sort of thing shall extend not to just our system of government, but also our systems of finance, infrastructure, and agriculture. In our world, farms are always seeing shifts of some kind, whether it be technological, economical, floral, or seasonal. Each passing year, the fields experience a change. How big of one differs greatly based on what location the farm is at, but ultimately one thing is clear: things are changing.

Farmers everywhere are seeing it. Newer tractors are being made, ones that reduce the carbon footprint in the world. Newer forms of irrigation are being introduced to reduce the need to use excessive amounts of water to hydrate crops. Biologically altered seeds that grow deeper roots and consume less water are being planted to replace older crop seeds, and livestock are being fed alternative food varieties to reduce the methane gas that they produce from their feces and belches.

Truly, in our world today, the traditional farm is becoming more and more modern and technologically relevant and as such farms and farmers are becoming more and more organized and cooperative with each other by the decade. Unions and agriculture organizations are always springing up and allowing for farmers to interact with each other and help benefit from each other with valuable insight on how to better prepare themselves and their crops to be used and distributed.

Where finally the one organization that farms and farmers have always turned to and relied on the most, begins to take root in the agendas of the farms, unions, and organizations; the government. The government has always been a seat of oversight for farms and agriculture in general. From the first civilizations of the stone age, to the space ferring societies of today, the government has always had a hand and an eye in creating and/or helping maintain a reasonable path for the agricultural world. Because of said guidance, many farms everywhere have been positively affected in building and maintaining sizable surpluses in both crop production and wealth ascertainment. For this it would be most beneficial that the United States do the same by creating a bureau of agriculture.

With a bureau of agriculture, farms everywhere would be more interconnected with one another and would allow for more economic opportunities for the farmers. Now, as previously mentioned in the subject titled ‘limit collective farming’, this does not mean that all farms must sign up, nor are they to be regulated beyond their control. As also mentioned in the previous subject ‘create bureau of employment’, it should remain optional. Why it should is simple: for one, no one is going to enjoy that their farm is forcibly made to work for an institution they have no say in. No farmer wants to be a part of a system that did not get their permission to acquire and access their assets and property. Secondly, people would become angry that the farm that they operate is no longer able to 100 percent function the same way they wish it to. Being forced by government mandate to plant whatever crop at whatever amount regardless of whether or not the crop is in high demand or if the farm even has the space to grow the crop at the scale the government has asked it to be grown would drive any farmer or to madness.
So to prevent any one farmer or from becoming disgruntled, and to prevent the institution from becoming bogged down by bureaucracy, an optional bureau of agriculture would be most

beneficial to American farms & farmers. And that a bureau of agriculture would be most beneficial to farms all throughout America.

Author’s note: For those who’re reading this. The bureau of agriculture is basically supposed to serve as a central administrative center for people working in agriculture. See it as being another version of the secretary of state combined with the aforementioned federal rehabilitation services: a place both to find administrative help and possible economic help or opportunities. Or in other words, the department of agriculture, but instead of just rules and guidelines, the farms are also given commercial opportunities.

Create Bureau of War Strategy and Domestic Conflict

I will be blunt with you on this one. War and conflict are two concepts that, no matter how well human society progresses or advances, will always be a part of our integrated psyche, meaning that even if humanity were to develop into an all peaceful, all compassionate society, we'd still see the urge, or more accurately, the potential for war or some other kind of conflict wherever we go. Take the early twentieth century for an example. When dynamite and machine guns were invented, people thought that there'd be no need or reason to go to war since all these, at the time, recently made death machines and army killers were invented. 1 decade later we have Archduke Ferdinand and Duchess Sophia dead on a street corner and multiple countries spanning 4 continents engaged in a 4 year long world war. After that war, people thought that because of the devastation it brought, that it would be the war that would end all wars and that the world would enter a period of perpetual peace and prosperity. However, sadly knowing the process that is human history, whenever something great and prosperous

is proclaimed, the words come back to hit ourselves in the face and give us something equally or 5 times worse than what had previously happened. Great economic prosperity was destroyed when the great depression happened in Germany after they paid the allies huge war reparations and tanked their economy due incompetence and general mismanagement.
Russia, after signing the armistice with Germany during the war, initiated a coup d'etat against the monarchy which, in the process, executed the Royal Family. Shortly thereafter, Vladimire Lenin, the socialist party leader and the new leader of Russia, died. Which resulted in leadership disputes between Lenin’s subordinate figure heads Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky, which then divulged Russia into civil war.
In Italy, Mussolini takes over the italian peninsula and installs a nationalized facisistic economy and government which, despite facisism being about having a strong state and an uncontested government, the country itself was actually mediocre at best. Hence why Mussolini is best remembered for the phrase “he kept the trains running on time”. A critique that he was doing a sup-par job and only really achieving the bare minimum. Several countries, due to their

insufficient management of their economies, wound up in similar positions as the United States now. Trying and failing to leech off of the defeated Germany (this was something the United States tried to do) and mishandling their trade agreements by placing up unnecessarily high tariffs in a vein effort to stabilize their economies. Adolf Hitler had created a manufactured crisis to allow the Reichstag to grant him dictatorial powers (Author's note: contrary to popular belief, Hitler did not actually use mob rule tactics to force the Weimar republic into giving in and giving him the powers he asked for to ensure his ascension to power. This is actually a common misconception as this was propaganda created by the Allied forces before and after the war to legitimize Hitler as a tyrannical monster. Although true that he was a monster, this fact about Hitler ascending to power is actually a lie.) and used them to turn Germany from a failed republic into a pseudo national socialist government run by a fascist dictator (for those who're unaware, fascism and national socialism are not the same thing, they can be similar if the society decides to be run by a dictatorship with absolute authority, but no, truthfully fascism and national socialism are two different concepts.).

The United States, which was the economic dynamo at the time, also becomes one of the various countries that mismanaged their economies and delves into the great depression, and due to the successes of Germany and Italy at the time in curving the depression, the love of fascism spikes in the U.S. and is only stamped out once the war is over and the death camps are found out. Spain also caught up in the tide of ideological separatism divulges into civil war and, to add insult to injury, becomes the guinea pig of so many dissenters and powers to “test out” their war theories and tactics for upcoming conflicts. In Asia, Japan having felt disgruntled from not being given better conditions from helping fight in the first world war, begin expanding into China and unleashing a wave of genocide and homicide so devastating that even Germany is sometimes refered to as less evil. Finally, after it all came to ahead, Germany invaded Poland in September of 1939 and set off the chain of events that became the second world war, resulting in tens of millions dead world wide, hundreds of millions scarred and wounded, and led to perhaps the biggest institutionalized genocide the world had ever seen. Slaughtering Jews, Slavs, Gays, the mentally ill, Gypsies, and various other ethnic groups to the

gallows and enslavement. All under a zeal of giving Germany its glory back and out of zeal for an unproven race theory that which now modern sciences has proven to be false.
It is heartbreaking to say the least, but so is the process of human history and the war and conflict that comes with it. Where one whom does not learn from it is doomed to repeat and mimic it. So the saying goes, and as such, when one refuses to learn from history, are either left vulnerable and weak, or are in the process of gearing up for war. In times such as these, it is best to prepare. Which is why when war is abroad or on the horizon, or a domestic affair is on sight and needs to be quelled as peacefully as possible, a war council is needed to drum up a proper plan so to de-escalate tensions and prepare for the worst.
Hence why the existence of a bureau of war and domestic conflict is a wonderful thing to behold a country. With a bureau of war and conflict, a country and its leaders are able to consolidate its top specialist for when times of crisis arise or need to be prevented. From needing to plan a proper strategy against an opposing threat to try to learn the best way to de-escalate riots, and prevent domestic terror from occurring. The bureau of War strategy and conflict would guide our leaders in

this chaotic world to better understand the changing motives of the world's conflicts, and the tactics that today’s world governments and insurgency groups are using.
For this i’d say that America, the military juggernaut of the world, would benefit greatly from a bureau of this kind. As it would ensure that we as Americans would be ensured that the generals, commanders, admirals, and politicians would always have a plan ready to help up and prevent the worst from reaching our lands.

Create a Vocational Workers Program

Vocational education. Its rewarding, its fascinating, and it’s the greatest teacher. How exciting would it be to learn how to repair and operate a piece of mechanical engineering? Very exciting in my opinion.
With vocational education, one can learn to achieve many great things and more so learn how to maintain and operate those great things. How fascinating would it be to live on a river and build your own water wheel? More so a water wheel that

generates its own electricity?? You'd not have to worry so much about the peskiness of the electrical bill that's for sure. With vocational education, one can learn how to perform better at their skill of choice, as well as fulfil their job's expectations. Though time and time again, hands on experience has always been the greatest teacher. Nothing, no matter how technical it becomes, will ever triumph over hands-on experience.

Even if we were to create knowledge implantation technology, hands on experience would still be needed in order for one to truly work with and understand their field of study and/or field of performance, which is why we need it for those in the workforce. In these trying times, Americans are now being made to perform more and more physically challenging tasks and occupations, many of which are facing automation and computerization with seemingly no end in sight. For this problem to be curbed, where workers and entrepreneurs are now being forced out of their chosen work fields out of reluctance and out of outside forces, we the people of the United States should take the initiative to help these increasingly being displaced workers find an easier way to integrate themselves in this continuingly mechanizing world.

Similar to the U.S. ETA (Employment and Training Administration), a branch of the U.S. department of labor, a federally run, or at the very least a federally sponsored workers vocational institution, would help workers of all fields with being able to cope with and keep up with this increasingly modernizing world. Workers of the lumber industry would learn how to operate and repair chainsaw tractors, rather than worry that because of chainsaw tractors; they would be replaced by them. Fast food workers would learn how to efficiently and hastily assemble the food they prepare rather than have to worry about a robot or an assembly line doing it for them. Customer services representatives would learn how to effectively work and behave in their environments to better increase production and income for the company they work for.
Factory workers would be given extensive rundowns of what machines they will work with and operate to better increase production and create finer finished products. With vocational education, people of all walks of life would be granted access to a fine place of learning to better prepare them for the workforce. Doing so would help them better understand the place of expertise they are going to be working with or wish to work with and

furthermore help them achieve a path of suitable success for them and their families, providing them various goals for economic ingenuity and prowess that they and their loved ones can ascertain that which was previously unattainable due to either financial or conventional reasons holding them back.

I’d say if we as Americans were to create a form of vocational education, America would not only be bolstered financially, but also productively and if implemented right, would perhaps even improve our national infrastructure and transportation system, increasing trade output and the flow of revenue in the country.

Lower the Veteran Pension Age to 25

Its tough being a soldier, being a veteran is rewarding in many ways but in many other ways is

scarring. If one goes to war and comes back alive, they’re a hero who's celebrated, but when looking more in depth into their physical and mental well being, they’re not all that ecstatic. A man or woman who goes off to war experiences many traumas, and like all traumas, some are permanent and stick with you until the day you die. If the beliefs of what goes on in Heaven or Hell are true, so too do they stick with you in the after life.

No man or woman who suffers from shellshock or PTSD should have to be treated to the suffering of such ailments. No matter how vicious they actually were, they, the man and the woman are still human and no man or woman who goes off to war young should have to be forced to live with the traumas they experienced and potentially live their days and nights in the gutter, especially in cases where and when they have no family left to support them. Veterans young and old are the sword and shield of our nation and as such deserve to be treated with the utmost respect.

Yet with this changing world, the veteran is beginning to be seen as a disrespectful and or disgraceful ‘other’, with many veterans nowadays being mistreated by activists and organizations alike, being trampled on both alive and dead. Sometimes literally. No man or woman who died

fighting and serving their country should be trampled on like some kind of chew toy by radicals, nor should any man or woman who lived having served their country should be made to fend for themselves once they are discharged from services.

A man or woman who fought on the frontlines or supported the G.I.s as equipment repairman, medical doctors, technicians, etc should like their combatant constituents be given proper payment for their services. Even those who served for a year or did not actively see combat did help their country in its time of need and were part of active duty personnel. Despite those men and women not seeing combat, they were subject to the same kind of work environment and training regimine that all soldiers had to work around and like their combatant constituents, are also looked down upon by the nair-do-well activists and organizations in society. All veterans deserve to be treated with fairness and respect, regardless of how long or how harsh their services were. So to give our veterans young and old alike, it would be grateful to them to provide a shining light at the end of the tunnel. That shining light being, lowering the age limit of acquiring their pension from 65 years to 25. The majority of America’s active duty personnel as of

2019 estimates are between the ages of 18 and 35, meaning that most of America’s army is composed of young men and women who, once they leave the services, are given no financial guarantee that they will be helped once discharged. Out of 8 hundred thousand active personnel within that age group that leave the services, 37,000 discharged personnel will experience homelessness, and like the 380 thousand discharged personnel of the same age group, will likely experience poverty.
For a lack of better reasoning, giving the ones who served our nation no access to financial help at such a young age is no short than the word disgraceful, especially when they cannot afford to help themselves out of the gutter and back into functioning society. For this I say lower the damn age limit and let our veterans who’re impoverished or homeless have a chance at life because nothing is sadder than seeing a man or woman whom fought for or served their country be treated so disrespectfully.

Illegalize Late Term Abortions up to the Eighth Month

I will be clear here. I am not against abortion nor am I against women whom want to get an abortion. What i’m trying to tell people here is that when it comes to abortion, one should not wait so long to get one. Around the eighth month of a fetus’s development, the fetus has developed long enough to where it is mostly ready to leave the womb and enter the world. A fetus at that stage of development has grown well enough to have a functioning heart, mind, nervous system, and mostly functional internal organs, and as such, is developed well enough to essentially be considered alive by most medical professionals. For a woman to wait such a long time to get an abortion is no short of the word absurd.

Now, this is not to say that the woman carrying the fetus is an idiot for waiting too long or that it is necessarily her fault for waiting so long to begin with, but it is to say that to wait so long when the process of getting an abortion is a rather short process, both length wise and the actual time it takes to remove the fetus, is nonsensical. To wait until the eighth month of a fetus’s development

when the carrier of the fetus can attain an abortion is one month more or less, depending on what state you’re in, is nothing short of nonsense. To overwait the time it takes to get an abortion by several months is effectifly overkill for the abortion seeker, as to do so would be both a waste of one's time when they could get it over with in the time frame they already have, and would be a moral and psychological dilemma on both the carrier and the peers of the carrier.
Now I am aware of the problems of this however. I do know that some women do not realize they’re pregnant until months after the fetus was conceived and do not find out until months later, however, I am also aware that most women whom do find out they were or are pregnant at such a time typically find out after the 5th or 6th month period. 2 to 3 months before the eight month period and within a 1 to 2 month timeframe they can schedule an abortion to be made to remove the fetus. If the carrier wishes to get an abortion there should be no reason to wait so long until then to remove the fetus when said fetus is already mostly developed and medically considered alive. If its over financial reasons or reasons concerning age, then ask for a sponsorship. Which is the next topic.

Sponsor Medically Approved Abortions to Impoverished and Underaged Carriers

As previously mentioned in the last topic, abortion up to the eighth month is, by this author’s opinion, very frowned upon. However, it is clear that not all women who’re seeking an abortion are necessarily just hedonistic debauchers or financially stable people. Some could be morally well but financially off and are unable to get an abortion. Some are mentally and physically unwell and cannot keep the child for said reasons, and some are children whose family is too poor to afford the abortion in the first place. All these reasons in mind, it is imperative that we not just blindly gloss over every woman who seeks an abortion as just hedonistic hussies or stupid acting children.

But rather, some are in fact well behaved but, due to the external forces of the economy, are incapable of ascertaining the medical help they

need to have a more stable life. It is with the utmost responsibility of the federal government to help these women in need to be granted the opportunity to remove a burden they have chosen to remove from their lives, and though as taboo as this is to the common citizen, it is a taboo we must overcome to allow for those living at the very bottom to have a more positive outlook on life. The federal government being the largest financial institution in the land should and must help these reluctant damsels in distress by easing their grief. To help, the federal government should optionally allow for people with financial strief to seek and or receive a hospitally approved abortion should they request it. However, this is not to say give every woman freedom to attain one willy nilly. Medical professionals are not capable of doing each and every type of surgery or medical care, nor are they always prepared for it and its not like they have the resources for specific kinds of medical care on hand 100 percent of the time. Therefore, to ensure that the medical system is not overwhelmed with abortion seekers and bewilldered parents, a limit must be placed to disallow women to receive an abortion if the woman over exceeds a certain limit within a certain time frame. In this author’s objective opinion, no woman should be allowed to

seek an abortion over exceeding 3 scheduled abortions in a 6 month period. 1 abortion for every 2 months should be the limit for any pregnant woman seeking a sponsorship and should the woman find that she has over exceeded the limit, then the federal government should be entitled to fine said woman for doing so and for straining the already delicate system. Only under intense circumstances, such as a life or death situation, being underaged, or the woman being mentally and/or physically unwell for carrying the fetus, should a woman be allowed to do so. All other cases besides these discernable factors, are up to what the government decides is appropriate and inappropriate to place in their sponsorships.

Lower the Gambling Age to 18

Yes I know what you're thinking. 'Why is this important?' and 'Why should we lower the gambling age down to 18? Is it not just fine at 21?' The simple answer to that is: yes. The more complicated answer is: sort of.

In order to understand why we should lower the gambling age, we must take an in-depth look into what gambling is and what is all about. Gambling, from what we all know, is the act of betting money in an effort to ascertain more money, regardless of risk. To the more religious people out there, the Bible is often used as a source of guidance on why gambling is a problem and should be avoided. Though the Bible is morally agreeable in many ways, it is, however, objectively untrue. As

gambling is a part of our everyday lives, even if people are unaware of it.
We balance risk and reward on a near constant basis. Every student at school or college gambles for a good test score, every employed man and woman gambles for a promotion and a payment raise, every politician gambles on persuading enough people to ensure their election, re-election, or to pass a bill, and every consumer gambles for a good priced product at the store whenever he or she goes out shopping. Gambling is everywhere and people often never notice it.
Gambling for money, however, is noticed. Where there is money to be made, there is alcohol to be consumed and sex to be done. As previously mentioned in the subject of lowering the substance use age to 18, doing so would open up a lot of rehabilitation prospects a fool hardy youngster would normally be barred from. Recessing their mental and physical health, and causing future problems down the line. In that camp of problems, also comes with gambling.
Reducing the age limit to 18 would not only decriminalize minors from making age based offenses, but also open up the gateway to rehabilitation for those who’ve done so secretly and against the law’s wishes. Young people are

rebellious and often keep their more gratuitous behaviors a secret. Disenfranchising them from something they'd naturally be drawn to would only stoke the flames of rebellion inside their minds. Therefore, if we are to curb the problem of underaged gambling, we should not harshen the legal code against them as they're naturally going to be more rebellious against it, but rather lighten up on the punishment all together and allow them to partake in such things both to reduce the crime rate and allow for people of the age to seek out help should they become too entrenched in addiction. After all, if the prison system churns out more offenders than it rehabilitates, why send them at all to prison when it would only intensify their addiction?

We've all heard the stories and we've all heard the tales from unjailed people. How in the jail or prison people would sneak in unwarranted objects and substances and gamble them amongst each other to both satisfy their addiction and their boredom. Why should we send our youths to such an institution when its clear to be ineffective and clear to be regressive? Surely it is clear that by simply reducing the age restriction and allowing for proper rehabilitation to occur. We will then see a reduction in gambling based offenses amongst youths and

see more youths seeking rehab for their problems rather than seeking a one way ticket to the jailhouse.

Mandate All Politicians be A-religious When in Public Office

Religion. It’s a touchy subject to talk about. Truly in this modern world, despite our social and ethical progression, nothing can be more divisive than a man’s or woman’s faith amongst the society in which they live in and cater to. America is the greatest melting pot on this planet and as such, has the largest pool of people to choose from when determining who and how well one shall be a leader. Without faith, the basic groundworks for our

great republic and the democratic values it encourages would hold no framework. However, with faith our leaders must then also walk a fine line between devout and moderate so as to not upset the general public and the delicate system they made an oath to build up and maintain.
From the beginning of the country as ~13 English colonies who proclaimed separation to where we are now, faith has played a key role in our republic's life since its inception. From the founding fathers to the current administration, all politicians hold dear to their faiths as much as their roles and their families and loved ones. Some maybe not, but most certainly do, and most politicians, despite their similarities, hold their faiths to their hearts as great as they do their ideals do to their minds. In regard to this subject, I the author, mean no disrespect to those who wish to be faithful whilst in office.
Faith is the founding dorce of all governance and is an integral part of our daily lives, and to shun one from practicing their faith whilst in office is no less than shameful. What this subject's aim is, is to not to insult or bewitch those who practice their faith, but rather to seek a compromise of sorts with those who're faith driven but are politically active. In our world faith can be used almost as much of

an ideal to seek reverence for as much as it can to bring forth judgement onto others, and to judge one for their faith but not of their ideals is, although agreeable, highly inappropriate and unacceptable, so to prevent such things from occurring, how about we seek a compromise with both our constituents and the general public as a whole.

Rather than identifying one by their faith or using our faith to justify certain issues, we instead keep our faiths out of public politics altogether. This way we as politicians can set a proper standard for those beneath and those watching and not have to worry about potentially causing an uproar amongst our fellow believers and citizens? This way when engaging in issues regarding faith we, instead of trying to solve them based on our own faith's standards, try to solve them based on our country's legal standards. The courts would be sympathetic to our cooperation and the general public satisfied that the issue was solved in an unbiased and civil manner.

Sure yes, the more devout would be dissatisfied, but as long as the majority moderates are fine, then we should be alright. This way everyone has a more fair approach to a solution and we can all continue to practice our faiths in private. So long

as we agree to this, there will be no upheaval. Correct?

Remove the Requirement for a High School Diploma for Low Skilled Work

Let’s face it people, no one should have to require a high school education for a field of work where most of us resort back to a middle school level of education, especially something as basic to

understand as fast food, pizza delivery, janitorial services, and basic assembly line work.
The world, yes;as mentioned numerous times, before is technologically improving and becoming more advanced and complex. So naturally more well versed people are needed to operate the increasingly industrializing and modernizing machines of the workforce. However, as also previously mentioned, the American education system is unsuitable for such a law to exist. Students are not being vocationally educated in the public school system and people most often have to rely on hands-on experience to educate themselves on what they're supposed to be working on.
Why should one who spent their days toiling away in an ineffective education institution be given a better opportunity to work in a basic job like a fry cook than an uneducated man who can do the same kind of work with the same level of work experience? No man or woman should be forced to live in poverty or without work simply because they didn't receive a slip of paper issued by an education expert saying you passed, more so a slip of paper from an education expert whose very likely poor at or ineffective at their own job in the first place. If a man or woman is good at flipping

burgers, washing clothes, cleaning surfaces, assembling small products, and shoveling trash; then there is no need to fire them for not meeting the one criteria separating them from an inexperienced person.
We as Americans should not have to resort to using the education system to determine who should or should not be allowed to work when it comes to low skilled, menial tasks. Doing so will just reduce the effectiveness of finding good candidates and as collateral, raises the rate of poverty as many Americans who cannot find a job or make a living without a diploma will be forced to scrounge and squalor. Take what had happened when the law was first implemented back in the late 2000s and early 2010s, after making it mandatory that all people must have a high school degree to work. Many people in many jobs of varying skill levels were all of a sudden out of a job and forced to either go back to school or face unemployment. Doing this made a lot of people go without work and contributed to the devastation of the 2008 recession, resulting in many businesses without employees and losing many skilled workers, hampering the economy and reducing product quality. Now, after a decade of time, those positions were filled in by inexperienced and

underperformed graduates. Many of which were youngsters who were a part of the ‘i hate hard work’ generation. Whereas the skilled people who lost their jobs had either gone back to school to re-enter the workforce or, like the many who were low skilled employees, had slumped into financial depression and forced onto the streets and into homeless shelters, some even with their families as well.

After years of gradual progression under the Obama administration of working the economy back up, many people, still without the requirement to have a high school diploma, are on the streets sleeping in sleeping bags, and begging for food. As Americans, we need to help these poor souls by giving them the opportunity to live AND work, so it would be highly rewarding to all Americans that we revoke the high school diploma requirement and allow for those without the ability to work again.

Allow Businesses to Easily Attain Permits and Licenses

America. The place of dreams and economic potential, a place where one can migrate, work their butts off, climb the corporate ladder, or get enough capital together and start a business of their own kind.

In the United States of America, business is a place where, despite the county's pitfalls, has through the latter portion of its history, been an economic dynamo. One where people of all walks of life can and have gotten the opportunity to make life for themselves and make it big, whether it be by working in a factory making cheap goods for small payment, working to become a business mogul, or working as a backscene actor and striving to become a famous actor over in hollywood. People of all kinds have the chance to work themselves into legends.

However, this world as IMMENSELY, previously mentioned, is always changing and becoming more and more complex and as such, so too is the business world and the ability to start up and maintain a business of your own. To curb this issue, we must talk about the process in which one is capable of starting a business. In the United

States, one must first acquire a business license and sales permit to allow them to be officially recognized as a legitimate entity. To do this, the business owner must file to attain both permits and/or licenses at the secretary of state in the state in which they’re starting the business, pay a small fee, and build your business to meet legal standards and health codes. After doing all of which, you are free to make and sell whatever sort of product or service within legal reasonability. Sounds simple, which is exactly what it should be: simple. Yet, due to the changing tides of the ocean that is the business world, this same system is becoming more and more complicated. Some complications are necessary, and some of which unnecessary. It is because of these unnecessary aspects that it is much more difficult for businesses, businessmen and women, and entrepreneurs from seeking and creating an ideal venture.

For businesses to succeed, the market must be both ideal and fair, and if the system is making it hard for the businessman or woman to begin or maintain their business, then the business will surely fail. Why should a business be told to uphold something like the affordable care act? The

affordable care act has been consistently proven to be ineffective and very expensive.
Scholars even widely agree that the health care plan proposed during the Nixon administration was both financially cheaper and socially broader, and yet it was turned down and we instead got an overcharged dumpster fire instead. Or why is it that businesses must report and/or record payments based on race and gender? Shouldn’t that all be optional, private, and most of all considered racist and sexist!? Wouldn’t a name and age just be enough?
As well, what of all these new social movements? Civil rights matters, yes, but what is the point of being ‘gender inclusive’ when there is only male and female and nothing else? Why should one be forced to cater to something that does not concern them or their business?
Forcing businesses, and by extent, business owners to abide by unnecessary rules to appease social lunatics is perhaps one of the most terrible things a legal system can push on its people. Why should I have to be made to accept the beliefs of someone I don't agree with? Shouldn’t simply going about my day and letting one to themselves be enough? Why should my business be forced to adopt these beliefs or else face shut down? If

anything, these laws being put in place, although necessary by some extent, are instead doing nothing to help the common business owner and are instead making it hell for them.
With this in mind, it is clear that we must remove these unnecessary laws and let the business owner decide whether they should uphold these things. If they agree with them, let them uphold them as they please. If not, then let the owners decide for themselves and let the customers be the ultimate judges of the business and its machinations.

Mandate All Politicians Give to Charity

The world is a harsh place, and the politicians that run the world are often corrupt. As for the ones who are not corrupt, they at the very least are more self interested than they lead on. Most often these sorts of people are the kind that don’t like or are not wanting to help their fellow common folk, but instead seek further enrichment of both themselves and their kin. Many of these said politicians are often very rich already, possessing vast quantities of wealth that much of which if they were to quit their jobs, would live out the rest of their days and nights in peace and without worry. As said by senator Bernie Sanders, it is often the millionaires and the billionaires that influence our country’s politics the most. Before that is, he dropped millionaires when he himself attained a million dollars. Although he is right that there are

some billionaires influencing our elections, the actual number of billionaires doing any influence pales in comparison to the millionaires. 2019 estimates show that there are approximately only 607 billionaires in the United States of America. Whereas estimates of the same year state that the number of millionaires in the country numbers around a whopping 11 million. A dramatically huge size compared to the slightly over 600 billionaires. So which means that by senator Sanders's original words (before he dropped millionaires), there are a lot more millionaires in this country that influence the country's politics and its agenda.

Now as for how many millionaires are in congress, the estimated number is 358 out of 530. A clear 2/3rds majority, making senator Sanders's original words correct in that there are too many millionaires influencing our politics and its agendas. But as for how many non-politician millionaires are influencing our elections or our politics is anyone's guess. Regardless, it is clear however that there are indeed too many millionaires influencing our elections, our politics, and our agendas. Not only that, many of which often choose not to help out our fellow countrymen in the broader sense. Yes, they help out when

discussing issues of social unrest, foreign policy, and some economic policies.
But most typically choose to play the persuade and forget promises card, opting to use the art of oratorship and occasional lofty promises than actually going out of their way to help. Seeking to enrich themselves and return little. Which is why, as a proposition of faith and loyalty of the politician, it is with perhaps great pride and virtue that we mandate all politicians, should they remain in office or underperform, be made by law or by tradition to donate a particular sum of money at least once a year to a public charity that which they do not hold any stake or claim in. This way, various organizations everywhere be it Saint Jude children's hospitals, the American Red Cross, Cancer research centers, FEMA, or simply a canned food drive or church fundraiser will all be assured guaranteed funding, and that all politicians who do not keep their promises or do not perform well enough can at least do some kind of giving back to the people that many often preach but never practice. After all, a millionaire is set for life once he or she attains a single million dollars, surely a politician with 2 or 10 or 100 million dollars can surely be willing enough to give out a few thousand dollars a year to a charity, correct? Its not like it

would hurt them in many major way. Why’d they have more to gain than to lose.

Prioritize Historical Education

You know the saying, how history is written by the victors. In many ways, this is indeed correct. In other ways, this is incorrect, what with the internet these days. But there is another saying that has also become more popular in recent years. One I’m sure you’re all too familiar with. Have you heard the saying, ‘those who don’t look at history, are doomed to repeat it’?

In a lot of periods of time, this saying has held vastly true. From the stone age to now, mankind

has been a rather atrocious society. From the beginnings of small isolated tribes and villages of our ancient nomadic ancestors, and our other ancient human ancestors like homo-erectus for one such example, humans have generally been a rather violent species.

Often, our violence has been what has prevented us from advancing since those times of old. Though yes, through conflict humanity has been able to progress technologically in many aspects, however, our biological impulses to be reactively violent to our surroundings has in many ways been the reason why humanity hadn’t and to this day hasn’t been able to progress and or unify. This is not to say, however, that simply removing a biological function will necessarily make things better for all of us. Quite the contrary.

All things have consequences, so removing that aspect of our integrated biology would likely result in something worse than what was intended, after all, the space frontier is violent and we have yet to go to war with aliens. But as from what we have seen through history, humans can be violent and oftentimes the reasons why we are violent are or can be recurring resulting in unforeseen repetition and causing unneeded bloodshed and turmoil in its wake. Take WWII for example: WWII and its

reasoning for happening was largely caused due to the same political instability and allegiance issues that the first world war was fought over. With the only major differences being that Germany was no longer a constitutional empire, but instead a pseudo-socialist/ethno-fascist state and that Russia was no longer a technologically backwards monarchy and instead an autocratically-socialistic industrial and technological powerhouse. Despite those 2 changes, the actual premise of the wars remained staunchly similar to the first world war. Resulting in the same kind of repetitive blood spilling as had happened in previous wars. The motives even remained mostly the same. Territorial disputes, wealth disparity, spreading the country's dominance, religious zealotry, and so on and so forth.

Another example would be the hundred years' war between England and France. The conflict started by a feud between the English and French nobility and was fought over the right to rule over France. After ~100 years of various wars and skirmishes, the French eventually became victorious and ruled over all of France. However, the full in depth reasoning and understanding for the conflict was over political unrest and cultural subversion. Both reasons that are typical of conflict both then and

today. However, the hundred year’s war took place during the height of the Middle Ages and at the beginning of the Renaissance, a time when most of Europe was still uneducated and oftentimes the nobility used this to exploit the peasantry into conscription, resulting in various wars of a similar caliber throughout other places of the world. Many of these same nobles and rulers often repeated various conflicts that could’ve been solved if they had looked back at history and remembered the treaties and diplomatic strengths of the Western Roman and Eastern Roman empires. How decades or even centuries of bloodshed could be resolved if proper diplomacy and cooperation had been made, they would’ve gotten far better deals and made far more profitable ventures this way had they looked back on history and learned from their ancestors.

If we Americans don’t wish to repeat the same mistakes of our predecessors, then rather than taking cursory glances and making biased opinions based on the bare minimum of what we were taught or had learned. We must make further dives into the history books, teach our children the full and unbiased truth, and prevent atrocities. Lest we become the very monsters we often demonize and tell ourselves not to become.

Shall we do so. Progress, political and economic stability, and religious and cultural tolerance will not only be our strength, but be our ally until the very end. Time is, after all, the ultimate historian and if we look backwards in time, we will surely see the future.

Establish Office Term Limits

Typical of all governments, an established term limit is crucial for how well the machinations of any kind of government or government system operates. Since the days of the ancient Roman republic to our modern day democracies, politicians and leaders of all walks of life have often

been plagued by the ever present problem of the so-called ‘deep state’. No not the conspiratory belief that the government is secretly being run by the illuminati or some kind of other shadowy organization. No. The deep state is, in reality, supposed to mean ‘one who is in government without official purpose’, meaning that a man or woman whose in office is not there due to the official system allowing them to have access to their position, but are rather there because of more nefarious or alternative reasons. An example would be an appointed representative having been in office or been involved in the bigger picture for far longer than their term or position would have officially allowed. A more accurate depiction would be like the speaker of the house of representatives having close ties to the president and access to their administration’s foreign affairs, despite his or her position supposedly barring access to such a thing and only allowing such a thing at the behest of the vice-president or president themself. This is the true definition of the ‘deep state’.
An official with an unofficially recognized precinct over the current or previous administration. Despite the fact that their official position of power shouldn’t actually allow them access to such things, unless of course, they possessed the right

criteria in order to ascertain said power and information. In most cases, this leads to politicians and leaders alike having a deep seeded grasp on everything without the general public's knowledge or consent, and given that the U.S. legislature is teeming with oligarchs, its no surprise that the general public is often fearful or willing to believe in the conspiracy of the deep state, and as of the recent allegations that have come out against former president Barack Hussain Obama by current president Donald John Trump, it is seemingly looking like that the conspiracy theory is becoming more so true than it ever has.

To prevent cases such as this from occurring, we need to place a more firm grasp on our internal machinations and set determined term limits of all levels of government. Similar to the current system, it would be best to keep the term limits short so as to not to allow for another kind of 'deep state' to take hold and run the system. As for how long each term limit should last, that depends on how important each position is. For the presidency, it would be preferable to limit it down to 5 years for each term and a maximum number of 2 terms for the position, allowing the president to hold office for 10 years and should they see an unsightly

tragedy, allow the vice president to take over and oversee the administration.
As for the vice-presidency, allow for the vice-president to rule alongside the president for the same term limit, but should a tragedy befall the president before the official term limit ends, then allow for one extra year in office for the vice president to bring together a functioning cabinet to their liking and to prevent any major disturbances from occurring under normal circumstances. This way, it ensures that the vice president turned president will be able to reconfigure things just long enough to keep the system functioning and from suffering any kind of total collapse if it were to proceed under normal circumstances.
As for the legislature, depending on how the system chooses to function (that meaning democratically or republicanly), the limit for representatives should be a term of 4 years and a maximum amount of 10 terms. Giving each representative a maximum of 40 years to be an elected official, if they choose to, and to make sure that no politician in congress stays in office for too long. As for Senators, a term of 3 years for each term and like the representatives, a maximum number of 10 terms per senator, giving each senator 30 years to be an elected official if they so

choose to, and again like the representatives, this way it makes sure that no senator can stay in congress for too long.
As for state and local elections, let that be up to the individual states to decide everything so as to ensure them their independence. That and it also declines the likeliness of there being unnecessary bureaucracy, ensuring the government to work more efficiently.

Adopt a Mixed Market Economy

Finally something about money, what a relief you might be thinking? To be perfectly honest, so am I. With the building of a socialist state, central planning and foreplanning is a must and, as such, so is the central planning for the economy. However, not all economies that’re centrally planned are necessarily entirely overseen by the government.

Some countries who are centrally planned are not as centralized as they appear or are said to be. Take China for example, China, though often said to be a communist state with a tight and firm control on its economy, in reality has much less control than you may think. As for what is provided on current day sources of information, China in reality only spends around 32.7 percent of its actual economy on government spending. Meaning that a whopping 68.3 percent is actually left up to Chinese civilians and private institutions.

Another example is Russia. Despite being popularly known by much of the west as being basically a neo-Soviet-Union. The Russian Federation, despite yes its known corruption problems, is actually far less centrally planned than it actually used to be. The amount of which it actually spends on the

economy is 33.95 percent. Which is in contrast to the USA. In America, we spend around 34 percent, which means that the USA actually spends 0.05+ percent more than the Russians, meaning that the United States, in actuality, is slightly more economically centralized than the Russian Federation.

Meaning that despite not being a socialist state, the United States already is inching closer to a more centrally planned economy. So if this be the case, why not emulate from the current system? Since the economy is already mixed, why not add on to it and make the marketplace richer with government spending? For example; countries that normally are considered to be decentralized economies are actually much more centralized than what is told. The United Kingdom for example spends around 39.3 percent of its economy, with France spending around 55.6 percent. Both of which are often cited as being market powerhouses amongst the western world.

Seeing the amount of countries present that are economic powerhouses. In this author’s opinion, it would be highly beneficial for the American people to adopt a mixed economy, or at the very least, improve upon the current one we already have.

Establish a Central Bank

Banking establishments are sometimes referred to as, ‘the burden of society’. In some manner this is indeed correct, as banking, especially in cases of paying back loans with interest, can definitely be a total burden to deal with. Ask any college student that and they’ll agree without doubt or question. However, despite the burdensomeness of the banking experience, no historian or economist can deny that the process of banking hasn’t had a profound impact on our world. Not just the world as in today’s world, but our world as in from the ancient years of the crusades to how it is now. During the years of the first crusade, banking had played an important role in helping fund the many conflicts that would come to be. Originally done by the Italian city states of Milan, Venice, and Genoa; whom were the economic kings of the mediterranean; the banking process was simple. Find a rich ruler or bishop and have them save some expenses and materials aside for the conflict to be. After a few more crusades were proclaimed, the process was then exported to the other

kingdoms and empires of medieval Europe. After the years of the crusades, the schism of the catholic church, and the rebirth of scientific and architectural innovation, the bank had held high prominence in our everyday lives. And throughout the course of the renaissance and industrial eras, banking had as much, if not a more, profound impact in shaping the various societal and economic ideologies of today.

From the birth of capitalism to the birth of communism, the banking establishment has played a major part in both ideologies' developments. Indeed, without the concept of the bank, the ideas of trying to own and control as much wealth as possible or trying to centralize and distribute wealth as much as possible would neither have been possible or at the very least as impactful without the premise of the bank playing a role. Banks are everything. Without them, economies can run rampid and money, without proper regulation, would be valueless and with a runaway economy, anything goes. From criminality to scandalism.

When looking back on our own history we see these same problems occur. Since the end of the American revolution, the central bank had played the role of fixing the decimated economy that the

newly made United States had created in order to fund the war effort. Beginning with Alexander Hamilton as the founder of the first central bank of America and as the U.S. treasury secretary. Alexander Hamilton’s banking establishment had done its intended purpose and fixed the economy as well as having led to 20 years of economic prosperity until it finally disbanded in 1811. After this event took place, the same economic problems that plagued the country post-revolution had begun to resurface.

States became the ones to decide the value of the currency and the arbiters of the minting process, meaning that from 1811 up till after the civil war when the central bank was re-established, the individual states were completely in charge of valuing and printing whatever currency they wished to print and each state had varying regulations. Some were on par with federal regulations, meaning that the state government took control and that there was definite value. Where others had no regulations at all and had freely allowed its citizens and businesses to print whatever and however large amount of money they so wished.

Even churches held sway in these states, resulting in severe devalument of each different currency

and oftentimes increased the likeliness of a ‘wildcat bank’ opening up and closing. A bank, for those who are not aware, that is opened or operates to swindle people out of their valuables, only to shut down shortly after and make off with peoples’ earnings. In many places, this forced people to revert back to the barter system, as it was the only feasible way to make any successful transactions without being handed over something that was worth jackshit. It was only until the American civil war’s conclusion that the central bank was re-established to permanently remove these financial problems and sort out the hectic mess that was the American economy post-civil war.

Over time, the effects of the re-established central bank took effect and re-wrenched the economy back to its former glory. Had the trans-pacific railway not gone bankrupt shortly after the civil war, however, the effects of the bank would’ve been more immediate and the south would’ve been more quickly rebuilt and perhaps far less Anti-African. Regardless, the bank’s effects took hold after time passed and the country’s financial fiascos were solved...

Until the devastation that was the great depression, the central bank of America had

overseen decades of gradual growth and eventual prosperity. The economy soared and the industrial revolution was shifted into overdrive, however, once the great depression took hold in the country, many negligences were finally realized resulting in mass bank runs and destitution. Part of the contributing failures that was recognized was everyone’s belief in placing their finances in credit, a long hated attribute of banking. You see during the roaring twenties, when the economy was never better, many people placed a lot of faith in the current state of the market thinking all was good and nothing would go wrong. The stigma was too big of a drug to resist, and the fallout once the drug’s effects wore off was to, say the least, haunting. Because of this drug, so many people sold their beliefs to a hype induced fantasy that ended up making them sell out beyond the point of immediate or short recovery.

Twas only after the financial policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt and America’s involvement in the second world war that the economy was brought back into stability. After which, the central bank played the role of helping finance the economic overhaul that took place between 1946 and the 1970s. Along with helping finance the space race and the mission to the moon, it is only until

recently that the national debt is unable to be solved by the central banking establishment. Not just because of the establishment, but also due in part of the less than successful policies of the past several presidencies. It is only until recently that president Trump’s businessman approach to America that the debt has finally begun to descend rather than ascend.

Should the American people transition to a socialist government, it must first establish a well operating and regulated central bank and anoint more business savvy politicians for without a man or woman who can do the job done and done right, will only the country finally be freed of this crushing weight that is the U.S. national debt.

Permanently Freeze Student Loan Debt and Interest

College education. Once the center of American learning, now a bewildered shell of its original self. Partially due to our negligence to keep up with the times, partially also on the part of students not being financially smart with their student loans, students today are nothing short of party animals and the ones who aren’t, are the studious and

secretive type shackled to the chains of institutional resource depletion with salvation only granted at the helm of a lofty promise or of a completely random miracle. So heartbreaking is the reality of the college student, forced to attend behind-the-times academics and to toil away having learned nothing.

Why go to a college to listen to a man on a podium sermonize for 40 to 50 thousand dollars a year when you can listen to a sermon from a priest at the local church for no charge at all? An educated man knows that talk is always free and that knowledge that can easily be attained through the removal of a book from the book shelf at the local library or from the click of a button on the computer, will always cost you nothing and gain you everything, so why bother at all sitting in a large classroom being lectured to by professors who hold no love for their own job to begin with? It only brings fallow and wasted potential to the students who attend.

Furthermore, the issue of the student loan debt has been an issue of great concern regarding the wellbeing of the graduate and the educated adult due to the alienating effects of compound interest, students and graduates alike are forced to bear the brunt of burden placed unto them without fair

treatment or chance. Forgiveness of the student loan would be saintly, yes, but not rewarding or forgiving to the debt demolishers. For without repenting upon your actions will you ever learn the wrongfulness of what you've incurred upon yourself.

So instead, it would not be in the best interest of the country to remove all student debt as doing so would cause financial uncertainty and would make those who gained said debts to begin with yield no repentance from it. Instead, any man or woman who needs to know the consequences of their actions, must face the music and pay off their loans but to give forgiveness to some regard, the country should force education institutions to cease all actions of debt interest so to allow all with student debt foresee that they be forgiven once and for all. No man or woman should have to or be forced to work against their wishes to work endlessly to pay for the education institution that gave them unfair treatment to begin with.

Prioritize Marketing Education

Ah, marketing. The driving force of economics and the catalyst of all wealth as well as trade. Without marketing and trading, society as we know it would

not exist. No human being in this world would perhaps even be alive if it were not for trade and marketing, for without the impulsive need to seek out alternative finished goods and then sell them for a profit in our own lands, we as people would perhaps not have been able to build the great expansive civilizations we see today.
We'd likely see countries and nations more akin to the Mongol horse tribes or the native american tribes of the American east or South American jungles, building only small clans that only built up enough to create basic protection and relying on hunting, foraging, and fishing for the sake of survival, never going beyond the age of stone or wood and only relying on oral and body language to educate our youths, and what people we would've encountered would either be of small scale interactions or the onslaught of war and bloodshed. As well, the organized faiths and institutions we see today would be more resembling the ancient pagan faiths at best, shamanistic or of a high priest never progressing beyond the belief of animalistic beliefs and depending on the tribe, human sacrifice.
Some still exist today, yes, but most have been left to the history books and no longer practice their ancient rituals of self harm or harm onto others,

and the ones that still do are in the most remote places that no civilized man or woman can visit, are kept on in secret behind closed doors and out of the public eye or in most, if not all places besides the most remote and secret of places, are outlawed by today's world governments. Today's governments that would not exist if not for the advent of trade and marketing.

Without marketing and trade, governments everywhere, regardless of how anti-monetary or isolationist they are, would simply not exist for without the existence of pro-monetary and pro-trade civilizations, these secualatarian societies would be surrounded by enemies and be plagued with the constant worrying of being potentially attacked from all sides for without money to satiate humanity's greedy tendencies (not to be spiteful against people who're greedy, just pointing out that its an ingrained part of our psyche), these societies would be placed in a perpetual state of war and conflict with those who seek out wealth and dominance onto others.

Without wealth, there'd be war for without wealth, what would drive others to seek out peace and prosperity? Humanity is psychologically predatory due to our always violent environment, so what would drive people to stop waging war if they had

no resources to identify as being particularly valuable to stop them from warring? Keep in mind, money or commodity money such as gold or silver are not the only kinds of resources humanity has used over the centuries. In many places, food and animals had been used as money instead of precious metals. In Africa; cattle had often served as money, in Central America; chocolate and jade had been used as money, in China; tools and knives at one point were used as currency.

So if no kind of valuable commodity or resource would serve or could serve as a standout reason for why humans should not throw themselves into the ring of violence, what would? Knowing the nature of human beings, it'd then come down to more 'passionate' commodities. If you get what I mean by saying 'passionate', then you will surely understand that that kind of commodity is even worse than materialistic commodities. Think of the children for a moment... Now stop thinking about that because you know what sort of hell it would be like.

So if it were not for money and wealth; men, women, and children would then be subject to a more hedonistic world. One where peace and prosperity would be based not on how well a society can finance its militaries and militias, but

by how well one is capable of pleasing the fairer other.
Truly, if it weren't for the advent of marketing and trade, humanity both socially and morally would be widely different than it is today, and likely very much worse off in many ways. When looking at more impoverished nations with limited resources, marketing seems to be one of the main ways these countries even stay afloat. Through the power of marketing, the current United States has managed to become a prominent economic juggernaut, eclipsing all else who awe in its proximity, and with it, is capable of affording to pay for and maintain some of the most expansive and expensive infrastructural grids in the world. So instead of bickering, why we must get rid of all money, marketing, and trade, we should take a good look at our current country. Take all that is good and all that has allowed us to proceed to where we are today, and press onwards. We should make marketing an instituted educational practice and make the book of the law a required book to read. For without proper education and proper guidance, no man or woman will flourish and no civilization will prosper.

Adopt Freedom of Religion

Faith. The basis for all logic and reasonable thinking. Without one’s faith, one cannot hold a conversation, hold an argument, or hold a debate without having faith in the words he or she speaks out. However, one form of faith has stood out amongst the rest and has done so virtually since humanity’s first steps. Faith in the all mighty and the other side. The faith of Gods and Goddesses. Throughout human civilization faith has been the foundation of many great societies, empires, and civil legal codes. From ancient Mesopotamia to modern America, faith in the divine and the influence of the divine has played an integral role in how human society has been shaped, molded, and formed. Take the Bible for instance, despite church and state being separate in American society, civil workers and legal workers have estimated that the Bible and its values and morals encompass 80 percent of the entire United States

law code, meaning that 4/5ths of all of the laws we have in our current system is influenced and or derived from the tenets of the Christian Bible. Though yes, the workings of the Bible have fallen out of the mainstream and, in many cases, have been demonized by the mainstream, it cannot be ignored that despite all the vitriol, the Holy Bible has, and still plays, a role in our way of life and the current system we uphold and live by.

Truly, for without the workings of holy books like the Bible as well as other religious writings such as the Torah and the Quran, human society would be far different than it would be as we see it today. Without the moral and disciplinary guidance of faith and religion, people both faithful and faithless alike would suffer tremendously, for without faithfulness and the religions that support it, there'd be no institutional guiding force to help us along the way. No man or woman can deny that without the church, the temple, the mosque, or whatever kind of other altar or house of worship, people would be lost and afraid. And also in many ways uneducated as well.

For you see without the institutional power of religion, society in many ways would not have been as educated as we currently are today. Before the industrial era, there were no public schools and

any kind of education that did exist, existed for the elites of society. Those with power were the only ones capable of attaining an education without the help of a generous or charitable religious follower and those without power could not dream of getting an education without the help of a religious institution. If religion was not present in a society that did not believe in compulsory education like our society currently does, then no man or woman, unless they had deep pockets, would dare to get or see an appropriate education ever in their lifetime. Through the interactivity of ideals and beliefs, faith has been able to guide human civilization through varying degrees of success into a prosperous life. Through interfaith dialogue, the sharing of beliefs and customs has led many societies to develop and adopt beliefs that we see today as being morally and principally good or positive, even including things such as women's rights, freedom of speech, the abolishment of slavery, equal rights, etc. Had religion not played a role, so many of these beliefs and principles would likely not have been created under normal circumstances. Instead, these values and beliefs which we have today would likely have been created by trial and error, and perhaps a little bit of philosophy. Philosophy is great, but you must remember back in ancient times, especially in

ancient Greece, people often believed that it was morally justified to cull the mentally ill and physically impaired, out of the belief that doing so would eliminate any weaknesses to human development and would free up potentially wasted resources. It wasn’t until the rise of christianity and the interfaith dialogue of European and Middle Eastern beliefs, that it became a forbidden practice.

Adopting freedom of religion would also help people in a lot of ways besides just education and the ability to influence. It would also prevent discrimination. Humanity, for thousands of years, has always been the dominant species and, as such, has become the arbiters of nature and nurture. However, this also means that humanity, if it chooses, can decide what is right or wrong, objective or subjective, true or false, etc. Including things, such as religion. Religious persecution has existed for nearly as long as human society itself. Due to humanity’s ingrained psychological function to be dominant over others or to appear as dominant over others, thus when it comes to religion, or our understanding of the world because of religion, will try to treat those of a certain faith group as people have done before of certain ethnic

groups: with disdain or disillusionment, simply for believing in different things.
Religious persecution has led to many horrible things: schisms, segregations, wars, and exterminations. Even religions that are normally very peaceful have experienced at least one of these 4 examples once throughout the course of their histories, dividing people of various differing backgrounds and ethnic groups and inspiring hatred amongst others and sometimes to great effect, such as when the Catholics of Spain enslaved the Native American societies for economic gain and destroying ancient religious workings and texts to punish those who did not convert or those who did not understand the religion enough to not know what they did wrong.
Another example is the Armenian Genocide, when the Ottoman Empire during WWI and the young turks, a turkish muslim military organization, masscred and deported up to 1.5 million Armenians for both suspicions of rebellion and religious indifferences.
Another example is the African genocide of King Leopold II. During the Belgianese colonization period of the Congo by King Leopold the second, King Leopold authorized the enslavement and mistreatment of various African tribes, even

allowing clerics and missionaries to be as corrupt and harmful as they wished, as long as they did not report anything back to Europe or America, or anywhere else. This genocide has been estimated to have killed up to as high as 10 million. Another, and quite obvious, example is the Holocaust. No man or woman in this day and age cannot mention genocide without mentioning the Holocaust. The holocaust, as all of you should know, was the period of extermination created and perpetuated by the Nazis and the Third Reich. Concocted by Adolf Hitler as a means of revenge against the Jews for their framed involvement in the great depression and the impoverishment of Germany. Killing an estimated 6 million Jews and 5 million more “undesirables”, ranging from homosexuals, disabled people, those who’d outspoken against the regime, and just generally unliked peoples. And finally we have a very recent example. The current Chinese internment of the Uhyghur Muslims. Today behind closed off areas of China, with information provided by escapees, satellite imagery, and sudden reports of mass people displacement from Middle Eastern countries bordering China. The Chinese have begun the systematic displacement and mistreatment of Uhyghur Muslims with reports of almost Nazi like

treatment in what are called by the Chinese as “re-education camps”. China has begun to persecute Islam, labelling the religion a “mental illness” and forcing all Uyghurs into these false re-education camps/truly concentration camps under the guise of helping the people they’ve interned, with some reports even confirming cases of organ harvesting, organs including livers, pancreases, kidneys, and even hearts.

To prevent such atrocities such as the kind our ancestors, predecessors, and even of what the modern Chinese are doing today, we should allow and enforce the adoption of freedom of religion so not to allow any malpractice of this kind or of a similar kind take place and ensure that all people of all backgrounds and origins be allowed to feel safe and to allow them to be heard without fear of persecution.

Regulate Firearm Sale and Distribution

There’s an old saying. That, “you can get more of what you want with a kind word and a gun, than you can with just a kind word”. Though menacing in its connotation, is still all the more true. Without a gun, one can not achieve certain ends, nor can one stave off certain kinds of peculiars from taking

over them and renouncing their rightful freedom. Another saying goes well for this kind of issue. One coined, or at least popularized, by former president Theodore Roosevelt, the saying goes, “speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far. This saying denotes that one who carries a weapon, shall not need to worry about going out into the world and fear those who might strike out.

These sayings go perfectly with the issue of conceal and carry. In recent times, the issue of legal concealment and carrying of firearms has become a topic of controversy by much of the American public. As to why, however, is rather unfortunate as it pertains to recent gun violence perpetrated by unlawful organizations, ideologues, rioters, and, in some parts, due to police negligence; incompetence; and governmental influence and/or incompetence. Beginning during the first half of the former Obama administration, racial tensions have gradually risen before spiking during the second half of the O.A. (Obama administration). Where finally coming to its precipice under the Trump administration. However, this is not to say that either administrations are to entirely blame for these events taking place, as the many minds of the various other politicians of the nation do also play

a role. From the Governors to the localists of political representatives and officials, they, either unnoticed or ignored, by the American people or federal government, are also partially to blame for these upheavals for they have the power to influence and oversee local and minor administrations and are also responsible for what goes on in their administrative regions, including cases of domestic affairs, crime, civil-discourse, the economy, education, civil unrest, etc.
For the reason that the government were to fail at meeting its goals at public safety and the general wellbeing of its citizens, the American people then turn to their own management of their own safety; acquiring food, materials, shelter, and most of all weapons. Weapons ranging from the smallest of pocket knives to the most immediately available firearms. Some, however, due to their beliefs or due to their unmanaged/unthought out emotions and ideas, attempt to ascertain some of the more unreasonable kinds of weapons. Most that do go this route usually do so without the legal prerequisites to attain these kinds of weapons in the first place. Some of these said weapons (mainly guns), are usually weapons that can only be ascertained by people of high enough military status, political importance, or police ranking,

which, more often than not, are usually stolen and or sold on black market sources.
To curb this issue, regulation must be set in order to prevent these kinds of unlawful or unwell people from attaining or seeking these kinds of weapons. With proper education on what is a civilian weapon and what is military grade, and proper assessment of a person's mental health and criminal record and with prevention of firearm and weaponry theft, we should be able to curb gun violence. Now, if only the education system would properly teach our youths the history and the actual statistics of racial tensions, racially motivated agendas of *certain* organizations, and racially motivated injustices, then perhaps we would finally see the decline of racial inequality in this country and the racially motivated agendas of organizations and politicians.

Thank you

Hello there dear reader, I would like to thank you for taking your time to read this book and its content. I do hope that it may have provided some insight to you and a better understanding to those whom are interested and or curious about the political ideology known as Socialism. However, I would like to make something clear to you all regarding this book. As you may have noticed there has been a subtle push for a more slow but gradual form of socialism, rather than the ‘collectivize as fast as possible’ kind that people are much more familiar with. The reasoning for that is simple.

For those who’ve decided to read this book up to this point, it should be clear by now that me, the author, am a man of long term planning and gradual progression, rather than one of absolute overhaul regardless of cost, like many other American Socialist seem to favor. Or effectively speaking, I the author am telling you, the reader, that I identify as a Neo-Trotskyist rather than as a Neo-Stalinist like many other American Socialists. Now to clarify, I am not saying that I follow the words of Leon Trotsky or saying that every other American socialist is a Stalin happy follower. What I am saying is that I, like Leon Trotsky, believe that socialism and socialist beliefs should be gradually

pushed for and implemented over time, allowing for people and the economy to settle in and get established first before making a total transition and to clarify what I meant by saying that other American sociailist are Neo-Stalinist, I am saying that, at least as I see it anyways, the other socialist of America seem to be people who want to make the transition to a socialist government to be immediate and to completely overhaul the system to fit whatever sort of policies they want from a socialist system regardless of whatever the cost may be. These 2 things are actually derivative of Stalinized socialism, which in case you are not familiar with Stalinism, the basic summary of it is, that the country must rapidly industrialize, modernize, and collectivize, regardless of the cost. What I've been able to infer from all this and from modern events is that other socialist of America want the country to immediately collectivize and modernize regardless of whatever the cost is. Since America is already an industrialized nation, there's no point in trying to industrialize, so industrialization has been removed and left with modernization since much of the industrial complex and American infrastructure is outdated compared to places like Japan and is decades behind.

So this is why I see many socialist of America as being Neo-Stalinist. They are people that want the country to immediately modernize and collectivize regardless of the cost. After all, just look at the Green New Deal as an example as the economic policies of it just shriek of immediate socialization or bust. Not to mention all these other new age Democrat politicians speaking about socialistic policies without giving any proper thought into them, and oftentimes when challenged, they offer little or no counter argument and more often than not say things like ‘well you just don’t get it’ or REEEEEEEEEE!!!

To say the least, us people who actually want to see these policies see fruition and not just be left to the history books as things said by some wild man or woman just to achieve an agenda, are pretty upset by these peoples’ actions and would rather they stay in their corners and let the true arbiters of this ideology take hold. The ones who actually know what they’re talking about and know how to implement such things without ruining the experience for everyone.

Anyways, aside from some of the more unlikely topics here, i do believe that most of what was said and explained could be implemented, should they be more well thought out and planned. Socialism is

a centralized and expensive ideology, and as such, requires quite a bit of attention to detail. Like all countries that’re mismanaged, the governments and their economies will fail, but socialism needs to be more thought out and executed more properly, if this proper operation isn’t met, it then suffers from the stereotypical trope of socialistic countries not working and falling into despair due to it being a complicated system that needs extra care.
Its like a steam train; big and bulky and requires extra care, its very efficient when used properly but unlike diesel and electric engines, its more expensive and frailer to operate. That’s practically why capitalism works well in many places, not because of the stupidly (and overused) simple answer; “because capitalism works”, but because of the fact it requires little attention to detail and just needs the basics of the system to be maintained and as long as the core functions are upheld then the system succeeds as is the case with all governing and marketing ideologies, but if not, then the system fails and everyone is lining up for the food pantry.
So to make sure that this largely centralized system works more easily and efficiently, rather than create our own system and hope to every god out there in the multiverse that it works, I thought

it was better to instead create a detailed plan first before jumping in and trying to establish a new system from scratch. Since socialism is centralized, it is only reasonable then to plan it out rather than start it up without properly assessing the situation. Ask any general of any army that question and I guarantee you that they will give you a resounding yes and ask any economist that question and most I'm sure will give you an answer of a similar caliber. Planning and foresight are key to basically all forms of governance, big or small, centralized or decentralized, federal or non federal, you get the point. I’d say this popular quote from Sun Tsu describes it best;

“If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle.” ~ Sun Tsu

Authored by Nicholas Campbell
Proofread and Edited by Kevin Rash